

FINAL REPORT

Case Reference: 1/2011

Bromsgrove District Council Standards Committee

Report of an investigation by Michael Blamire-Brown appointed by the Monitoring Officer for Bromsgrove District Council into an allegation concerning Councillor Del Booth.

DATE: 29th February 2012

Gateley

One Eleven
Edmund Street
Birmingham
B3 2HJ
DX: 13033 Birmingham – 1
t: +44 (0) 121 234 0000
f: +44 (0) 121 234 0001
www.gateleyuk.com

Contents

- 1 Executive summary**
- 2 Councillor Del Booth - official details**
- 3 The relevant legislation and protocols**
- 4 Details of the complaint**
- 5 The evidence gathered**
- 6 Response by Councillor Del Booth**
- 7 Summary of the material facts and findings of fact**
- 8 Reasoning as to whether there have been failures to comply with the Code of Conduct**
- 9 Responses to draft report**
- 10 Finding**

Appendix

Schedule of Documents

1 Executive summary

- 1.1 I have been appointed by the Monitoring Officer for Bromsgrove District Council to undertake an investigation into an allegation that Councillor Del Booth, a member of Bromsgrove District Council, may be in breach of the Code of Conduct for members of the Council.
- 1.2 The allegation (see **Document 1**) is that Councillor Del Booth failed to declare a personal interest at a meeting of the Bromsgrove District Council's Cabinet held on 5th October 2011.
- 1.3 The allegation was made by Councillor Shannon, also an elected member of Bromsgrove District Council and considered by the Assessment Sub-Committee by way of local assessment on 23rd November 2011. The decision (see report and decision - **Document 2**) was to refer the allegation to the Monitoring officer for investigation.
- 1.4 The outcome of the investigation is that Councillor Del Booth, the subject of the allegation, is in breach of the code of conduct of Bromsgrove District Council by failing to declare a personal interest as required by paragraph 9 of the Code but that he did not have a prejudicial interest and was not in breach of paragraph 12 of the code.

2 Councillor Del Booth - official details

- 2.1 Councillor Del Booth was first elected to office as a member of Bromsgrove Council on 3rd May 2007 for a term of 4 years and subsequently re-elected for a further term on 5th May 2011.
- 2.2 Councillor Del Booth gave a written undertaking to observe the code of conduct for Bromsgrove District Council on 19th May 2011.
- 2.3 Councillor Del Booth is the Portfolio Holder for Business Transformation with special responsibility for town centre regeneration and special projects. He is also a member of the Appointments Committee of Bromsgrove District Council.
- 2.4 Councillor Del Booth has completed the register of interests.
- 2.5 Councillor Del Booth has received code of conduct training, the Council's records showing that he attended a code of conduct session on 18th June 2008.

3 The relevant legislation and protocols

- 3.1 Bromsgrove District Council has adopted a code of conduct (see **Document 3**). The adopted code is in the form set out in the Schedule to the Local Authorities (Model Code of Conduct) Order 2007 (the mandatory code).
- 3.2 The mandatory code of conduct states that it should be read together with the general principles prescribed by the Secretary of State. The

general principles do not form part of the code but set out the principles which are to govern the code.

- 3.3 An extract of the provisions of the code of conduct (as set out in full in **Document 3**) which appear to be relevant to the scope of the investigation are as follows:-

Paragraph 8(1) Personal interests

You have a personal interest in any business of the authority where either:-

- (a) It relates to or is likely to affect:-

(ix) any land in the authority's area in which you have a beneficial interest

or

- (b) a decision in relation to that business might reasonably be regarded as affecting your well-being or financial position or the well-being or financial position of a relevant person to a greater extent than the majority of other council tax payers, ratepayers or inhabitants of the electoral division or ward, as the case may be, affected by the decision;

- (2) In sub-paragraph 1(b), a relevant person is:

- (a) a member of your family or any person with whom you have a close association; or

Paragraph 9(1) Disclosure of personal interests

Subject to paragraphs (2) to (7), where you have a personal interest in any business of the authority and you attend a meeting of the authority at which the business is considered, you must disclose to that meeting the existence and nature of that interest at the commencement of that consideration, or when the interest becomes apparent.

Paragraph 10(1) Prejudicial interest generally

10(1) Subject to paragraph (2) where you have a personal interest in any business of the authority you also have a prejudicial interest in that business where the interest is one which a member of the public with knowledge of the relevant facts would reasonably regard as so significant that it is likely to prejudice your judgement of the public interest.

10(2) You do not have a prejudicial interest in any business of the authority where that business:-

- (a) does not affect your financial position or the financial position of a person or body described in paragraph 8;

(b) does not relate to the determining of any approval, consent, licence, permission or registration in relation to you or any person or body described in paragraph 8; or.....

Paragraph 12(1) Effect of prejudicial interest on participation

12(1) Subject to sub-paragraph (2), where you have a prejudicial interest in any business of the authority:

(a) you must withdraw from the room or chamber where the meeting is being held:

.....

(ii) in any other case, whenever it becomes apparent that the business is being considered at that meeting.

4 Details of the complaint

- 4.1 The allegation(see **Document 1**) relates to a meeting of the Cabinet of Bromsgrove District Council held on 5th October 2011 when the meeting had under consideration the transfer of land comprising the recreation ground at Housman Close, Charford, Bromsgrove to Bromsgrove District Housing Trust (BDHT). It is alleged that Councillor Del Booth owns land and a dwelling house at 15 Housman Close which overlooks the former play area, that he remained in the room and participated in the discussion about the transfer of the land.
- 4.2 The complainant is Councillor Sean Shannon. Attached as **Document 4** is a note of my meeting with him.
- 4.3 Councillor Shannon did not attend the meeting of the Cabinet held on 5th October 2011. Matters had been raised at that meeting which caused him to listen to the official tape recording of the meeting kept by the Council. Whilst listening to the tape Councillor Shannon realised that Councillor Del Booth, who he knew lived at 15 Housman Close had taken part in the discussion on the item relating to the proposed disposal of the former play area at the rear of Housman close.
- 4.4 Councillor Shannon was of the view that as a result of the Cabinet decision, the value of Councillor Del Booth's property would increase and that as a result Councillor Del Booth should have declared a personal and a prejudicial interest.
- 4.5 Councillor Shannon has referred to a statement by the Leader of the Council reported in the local press, describing the former play area as "troubled". Councillor Shannon has also referred me to an article in the Bromsgrove Advertiser (see **Document 5**) which refers to the "troubled area of open space".
- 4.6 Councillor Shannon has also referred to the crime statistics for the locality and from his own knowledge as local councillor being aware that there was considerable trouble in the area involving criminal offences and anti-social behaviour. There had been an off licence in Rock Hill nearby which had previously been involved in under age sales. The recreation land itself was a conduit for crime on the

Charford estate with escape being readily available along the footpath adjoining the recreation land. There had been reports of drug taking and the presence of needles on the land.

- 4.7 Councillor Shannon gave an example of a similar area of land nearby "the Old Quarry" where there had been problems of crime and anti-social behaviour where development had successfully dealt with these problems.
- 4.8 Councillor Shannon considers that the redevelopment of the recreation land at the rear of Housman Close will lead to an increase in property prices generally in the area because the possibility for interference with adjoining properties will be eliminated and that this will have an effect upon the attractiveness of properties in the area. He maintains that the development of the recreation land for social housing on the recreation land will contribute to making the area generally safer and improve the locality. Location being an important element in determining property prices and an improved location leading to an increase in house prices.

5 The evidence gathered

5.1 The facts in this case are as follows:-

- (a) Councillor Del Booth is the owner of 15 Housman Close Charford Bromsgrove where he lives with his partner. The property which is in the Charford ward is held in joint names with his partner.
- (b) Councillor Booth is an elected member of Bromsgrove District Council and on election following the May 2011 elections signed a declaration of acceptance of office which included an undertaking to observe the Council's code of conduct.
- (c) Bromsgrove District Council has adopted a code of conduct for its members as required by the Local Government Act 2000.
- (d) Bromsgrove District Council's register of member's interests maintained by the Monitoring Officer shows that Councillor Booth has, as required by the code of conduct, registered his interest as owner of land at 15 Housman Close.
- (e) Councillor Booth is a member of the Council's Cabinet and in that capacity attended a meeting of the Cabinet held on 5th October 2011. On the agenda as item No 10 was an item which related to the proposed transfer of former recreation land at Housman Close to BDHT entitled "Support to Principal Preferred Partner Registered Providers in the delivery of Affordable Housing". A copy of the report is **Document 6**. The report was circulated with the agenda in advance of the meeting and members of the Cabinet would have had an opportunity to read the papers in advance.
- (f) Councillor Booth did not declare a personal interest in agenda item 10. Furthermore the minutes (see **Document 7**) make no record of any declaration of interest.

- (g) Councillor Booth remained in the room during the whole consideration of the item and took part in the discussion.
- (h) On 13th December 2011 I visited Number 15 Housman Close to check the views of the recreation land and also to see the recreation land itself.
- (i) The recreation land is proximate to the Councillor Booth's property. Number 15 is a corner plot and the boundary of his land at the end of his garden does not quite extend to the recreation land boundary. The Land Registry Title Plan (see office copy and plan – **Document 8**) shows the extent of the land ownership of 15 Housman Close and its relationship with the recreation land. The distance from the boundary fence of Number 15 to the recreation land at its nearest point is approximately 8 metres.
- (j) The recreation land (see plan attached to the Cabinet Report of 5th October 2011 (see **Document 9**) is a small area of open grassed land which at one time was used as a children's' play area. The land is surrounded by properties in Housman Close, Austin Road and Morris Walk. A footpath runs at the edge of the recreation land connecting Austin Road and Rock Hill. The boundaries of gardens adjoining the land in Austin Road, and Housman Close are well fenced with trees and hedges so the recreation land is well screened from properties in Housman Close.
- (k) The rear of 15 Housman Close is visible from the recreation ground and from the Number 15 there is a view of the corner of the recreation land site from an upstairs bedroom. The recreation land is not visible from either downstairs or the garden.
- (l) The recreation land is open space land which was the site of a recreation area which is no longer required by the Council for formal recreation. It is a small area of land which is unused and its future use is proposed as affordable housing. Paragraph 3.23 of the Cabinet report indicates that the recreation land might provide for four or six bungalows. The minutes of the meeting state that BDHT had included a scheme for the provision of six bungalows.
- (m) In December 2006 the Cabinet considered a report on the proposed disposal of the recreation land to BDHT (see report and minute **Document 10**). The minute of the decision shows that approval was at that time given for disposal on a below market value basis to be negotiated.
- (n) I made enquiries of the Council's Strategic Housing Manager (Mr Coel) and asked him why it was necessary for the proposed disposal of the recreation land to be subject to a further approval from the Cabinet. He conceded that strictly it was probably not necessary for a further consent to be given, the only difference being that the decision in October 2011 sought specific approval on the basis of a nil capital receipt. The October 2011 Cabinet report was also concerned with the ring fencing of the new homes bonus for re-investment in affordable housing.

- (o) Mr Coel has also confirmed to me that as yet no application for planning consent has been made by BDHT in relation to the recreation land.
- (p) On 5th October 2011 the Cabinet received a report (see **Document 6**) which:-
- referred to the decision taken in December 2006 to approve the disposal of the land.
 - Stated that the land was currently an open space play facility within the boundary of the Charford Regeneration Scheme, an area that had since then undergone extensive estate layout remodelling and refurbishment by BDHT.
 - Pointed out that that consultation had indicated the benefits of developing four or six additional units (bungalows) for older people in close proximity to the OAP bungalows in Morris Walk.
 - Advised that feedback from residents and the police indicated that the land in question was not suitable for a play area and not conducive to the overall improvements targeted through the wider Austin Road regeneration scheme.
 - Pointed out that over the years there had been a history of complaints by local residents of annoyance and nuisance emanating from the site.
 - Progress of the scheme had been delayed due to prolonged negotiations with the National Playing Fields Association and Fields in Trust who had the benefit of a covenant.
 - BDHT had included the development of 6 bungalows on the land for the purpose of their bid to the Homes and Communities Agency.
- (q) Councillor Shannon referred me to crime statistics for the area. I have checked the www.police.uk website which gives details of crime statistics. A search as against the post code B60 3LY provides figures in respect of all types of crime for the Charford neighbourhood area. The extent of the Charford area for this purpose is shown on the plan at **Document 11**. The level of crime in December 2011 was 71 crimes (a crime rate of 13.73 per 1,000 population). This is stated to be above average for the rest of England and Wales.
- (r) I have considered the general property prices in the Housman Close area based on the postcode B60 3LY. There are a number of websites which provide details of property prices paid and estimates of current value with reference to average house prices in the area. One such site is "Zoopla" (www.zoopla.co.uk) and a search result is shown as **Document 12**.
- (s) The purchase price of 15 Housman Close (January 2007) as shown on the Land Registry Proprietorship Register was £147,000. The Zoopla estimate today (February 2012) is £144,471. The Zoopla website also provides a graph showing average home values for B60 comparing the property (15 Housman Close), properties in B60 and the UK average.

- (t) I have decided in this investigation not to incur the expense of instructing a valuer to verify the above figures. My conclusion in relation to the available evidence is that property prices will be governed by a number of factors such as the housing market generally, the demand for particular house types and availability of similar properties, the area in which a property is situated and the state of repair of a property.
- (u) I accept that the incidence of crime in an area will have some influence on confidence by purchasers and in turn may have some effect on values but I do not think it is possible to draw a definite conclusion as to whether in the specific circumstance of this case the development of the recreation land will materially affect the value of 15 Housman Close as against all the other influencing factors.

6 Response by Councillor Del Booth

- 6.1 Councillor Del Booth has co-operated fully and helpfully with the investigation.
- 6.2 Attached as **Document 13** are his answers to a short questionnaire which I asked Councillor Del Booth to complete. His answers confirm certain factual matters set out in this report.
- 6.3 In answer to question 14 Councillor Del Booth states that he made a conscious decision not to declare a personal interest as his property was not attached to the boundary of the land in question as a garden is between his property and the garden in question. He states that he cannot see the property (the recreation land) from his garden and refers to a photo. 1 (See **Document 14**). He can see the property from his rear window, although only a corner of it as the majority is obscured by trees and he refers to photo. 2 (See **Document 14**).
- 6.4 Councillor Del Booth states that he did not believe the sale would affect his wellbeing as he has never had any issues with the land and his neighbours in the past or current have never expressed any issue with the land.
- 6.5 Councillor Del Booth does not believe he would gain financially (i.e his house price increasing) due to the area he lives in having a high proportion of social housing and a reputation within Bromsgrove (rightly or wrongly) of being a troubled area. Therefore, he considers that the sale of this land for 2 – 3 retirement bungalows would he believes have no financial impact on his property.
- 6.6 I interviewed Councillor Del Booth on 14th December 2011. He confirmed the answers given to me in response to the questionnaire (see **Document 13**). He accepts that he may have misjudged the requirement in the Code for him to declare a personal interest on the basis that the proposals in the report to the Cabinet would be likely to have an effect his property, although not financially and that a member of the public knowing the relevant facts would have expected a member to declare such an interest in the interests of transparency.

- 6.7 I have concluded that although Councillor Del Booth may have considered before the meeting whether he did have a personal interest, he did not do so sufficiently in accordance with the Code and did not seek advice. He clearly regrets that he did not declare a personal interest and states that in future he will very carefully consider the need to declare and act on personal interests.

7 Summary of the material facts and findings of fact

- 7.1 Councillor Del Booth is the owner of Number 15 Housman Close together with his partner.
- 7.2 He attended a meeting of the Cabinet on 5th October 2011 and did not declare a personal interest in agenda item 10 relating to the proposal to transfer the recreation land at Housman Close to BDHT at nil consideration.
- 7.3 Number 15 Housman Close is in close proximity but does not adjoin the recreation land. The distance from the end of the garden at Number 15 to the recreation land is approximately 8 metres. The recreation land is only visible from an upstairs window.
- 7.4 The report to the Cabinet on 5th October 2011 is on the basis that the recreation land is no longer suitable as a play area and is no longer conducive to the overall improvements targeted through the wider Austin Road regeneration scheme. The recreation land is within the boundary of the Charford Regeneration Scheme. The report points out that there has been a history of complaints by local residents of annoyance and nuisance emanating from the site.
- 7.5 The Cabinet had already determined in December 2006 the principle that there should be a disposal of the recreation land to BDHT but the issue was the basis of valuation.
- 7.6 The planning status of the land had not changed as a result of the disposal decisions and a planning application would need to be made and approved by the Council before any development could take place. There would also need to be a statutory advertisement under the Local Government Act 1972 advertising the proposed disposal of open space land (see paragraph 3.6 of the Cabinet Report).
- 7.7 I have not sought to obtain a professional valuation of the value of Number 15 Housman Close before and after the decision of 5th October but on the balance of probability I find that it is more likely than not that there would have been no change in the value of Number 15 on the basis that the Cabinet decision was in effect to approve the principle of nil consideration. The Cabinet was not making a planning decision in relation to the land; that would be a matter to be determined on a planning application. Furthermore, I accept that a land transaction itself in these circumstances is unlikely in itself to have a financial impact on nearby property.

8 Reasoning as to whether there have been failures to comply with the Code of Conduct

- 8.1 Councillor Booth in attending the Cabinet meeting on 5th October 2011 in his capacity as an elected member of the Council was clearly acting in an official capacity by conducting authority business within the meaning of paragraph 2(1) of the code of conduct. The code of conduct is therefore engaged and Councillor Booth was subject to its provisions when attending that meeting.
- 8.2 Paragraph 1(4) of the code defines "meeting" as including any meeting of the executive (Cabinet) of the authority. The provisions of paragraphs 8, 9, 10 and 12 of the code govern the obligations placed upon Councillor Del Booth to declare personal interests and to act upon prejudicial interests.
- 8.3 The first question is whether a personal interest arises under paragraph 8(1)(a)(ix) - "*You have a personal interest in any business of your authority where either (a) it relates to or is likely to affect – (ix) any land in your authority's area in which you have a beneficial interest..... or (b) a decision in relation to that business might reasonably be regarded as affecting your well-being or the financial position or the well-being or financial position of a relevant person to a greater extent than the majority of other council tax payers, ratepayers or inhabitants of the electoral division or ward, as the case may be, affected by the decision;*". Does the proposal for disposal of land at Housman Close relate to or affect Councillor Booth's ownership of 15 Housman Close and does it affect his well-being?
- 8.4 The Standards for England (Guide for Members – May 2007) makes it clear that there are two types of personal interest. First, "*a personal interest in any business of your authority where it relates to or is likely to affect an interest you must register*" and secondly, an interest that is not on the register, but where the wellbeing or financial position of family members is likely to be affected by the business of your authority more than it would affect the inhabitants of the ward affected by the decision.
- 8.5 The Standards for England (Guide for Members – May 2007) explains that the term "wellbeing" can be described as a condition of contentedness and happiness. "*Anything that could affect your quality of life, either positively or negatively is likely to affect your wellbeing or the wellbeing or financial position of a family member or close personal associate to a greater extent than it would affect the inhabitants of the ward affected by the decision*".
- 8.6 The wording of paragraph 8 is couched in terms of "*relate to or is likely to affect*". The test as to whether a personal or prejudicial interest arises was considered by the High Court in *Scriven v Ethical Standards Officer* [2005] EWHC 529 and determined to be an objective test. Mr Justice Stanley Burnton said:-

“Whether a member has a personal or prejudicial interest is a question to be determined objectively. The mistaken but reasonable view of the member that he has no such interest is irrelevant. The test for a failure to comply with the Code by failing to comply with [the paragraphs dealing with personal and prejudicial interests] is similarly objective”.

- 8.7 I take the view that applying the objective test, the proximity of the recreation land to No 15 and the basis of the proposals for the disposal of the recreation land, including the advantages for the area of possible use in the future for housing as set out in the report to the Cabinet is such that the proposals would be viewed by an objective bystander as being “likely to affect” Number 15 Housman Close and also would affect Councillor Booth’s well-being to a greater extent than other council tax payers in the Charford Ward. This gives Councillor Del Booth a personal interest in respect of his ownership of Number 15 Housman Close.
- 8.8 The second limb of paragraph 8 applies where the decision might reasonably be regarded as affecting the wellbeing or financial position of a family member or a person with whom the member has a close association (which clearly includes a person’s partner).
- 8.9 Although there is no obligation in the Code upon Councillor Del Booth to register in the register of interests, the interest of his partner in 15 Housman Close, his partner is a relevant person whose interest must be considered. In my view the proposals in the report affected those properties immediately surrounding the recreation land (including Number 15 Housman Close) to a greater extent than other inhabitants in the Charford Ward and applying the objective test, the proposals in the report affect the wellbeing of Councillor Del Booth’s partner which give rise to a personal interest within the meaning of paragraph 8.
- 8.10 On the basis that Councillor Del Booth had a personal interest in agenda item 10 of the Cabinet meeting held on 5th October 2011, he had an obligation under paragraph 9 of the Code to declare that interest and its nature at the commencement of the meeting. His failure to so declare amounts to a breach of the Code.
- 8.11 A member who has a personal interest is permitted by the Code to remain in the meeting and participate in it provided the interest is not prejudicial.
- 8.12 Where a member has a personal interest, the question arises as to whether that interest constitutes a prejudicial interest. Paragraph 10(2) of the code provides that a member does not have a prejudicial interest where it does not affect his financial position (or the financial position of his partner). In addition, a prejudicial interest does not arise where it does not relate to the determining of any approval, consent licence, permission or registration in relation to the member (or in this case his partner).
- 8.13 I have found that the financial position of the owners of Number 15 is not affected by the decision and the provisions of paragraph 10(2) in my view exclude a prejudicial interest in this case.

- 8.14 Even where the member's financial position is affected, the member, in deciding whether he has a prejudicial interest has to determine whether the test applies as set out in paragraph 10(1) of the code which provides that the interest is prejudicial where it is "*one which a member of the public with knowledge of the relevant facts would reasonably regard as so significant that it is likely to prejudice your judgement of the public interest*". The test is not whether the value of Councillor Del Booth's house will or will not increase but whether any change in his financial position which might result would affect his judgement in decision making.
- 8.15 In this case, the basis of the Cabinet's discussion was whether proposal for a nil value transfer of the recreation land was acceptable in the circumstances. Councillor Del Booth spoke to that issue and it is difficult to see, looking at the issue objectively, that in doing so the public interest was in any way harmed. Indeed he was clearly protecting the public interest and any financial interest he may have had in the value of his own property could not in my view be objectively viewed as "so significant" that it could affect his judgement on that issue.
- 8.16 I have concluded that Councillor Del Booth did not have a prejudicial interest and his participation in the meeting for agenda item 10 was not a breach of paragraph 12 of the Code.
- 8.17 There is no evidence that Councillor Booth's failure to declare a personal interest involved a deliberate action to mislead and there is no question of any motive to gain financially or otherwise.

9 Responses to the draft report

- 9.1 Before submitting this final report I have given an opportunity to both Councillor Shannon as the complainant and Councillor Del Booth to comment on a draft of this report. A copy was sent to each of them by post on 14th February 2012 and comments were requested within 14 days.
- 9.2 Councillor Del Booth has responded to say he has no comments.
- 9.3 Councillor Shannon has submitted comments and these are set out in full in **Document 15**.
- 9.4 Councillor Shannon raises a number points to which I set out my comments below:-
- (a) (Point 1) There is a lot of information in the Zoopla search (**Document 12**) which I have extracted in full for the sake of completeness. I accept that some information in it is not relevant to the specific issues. I do not think the Zoopla report is actually suggesting that property prices will rise by 10%. The "Zoopla Poll" on page 63 of the Appendix seems to have 10% as a default position where the visitor to the website is being asked to make a suggestion.

The Zoopla poll itself is not relevant to the conclusions reached in my report. The purpose of including the Zoopla report was to

show some current information about existing prices and past trends rather than a forecast of future prices.

The particular relevance of the Zoopla report is that in my view it supports my conclusion that property prices are influenced by a number of different factors.

I have already set out my reasons for not instructing a valuer as the issue in my view is not the effect of any development of the play area site but rather the effect of the decision of the Cabinet which is directed towards the valuation basis.

- (b) (Points 2 and 3) Councillor Shannon draws attention to Councillor Booth's statement that Councillor Booth "considers that the sale of this land for 2-3 retirement bungalows would he believes have no financial impact on his property". He points out that the Cabinet report suggests the development of four or six bungalows, the site plan indicating seven bungalows and eight parking spaces. Although I agree there is a difference, I have interpreted the thrust of Councillor Del Booth's statement as being simply that he does not consider that there would be a financial impact on his property. I have set out in my report why I conclude there is no financial impact (see paragraph 7.7).
- (c) Point 4) On the issue as to whether or not Councillor Booth's neighbours have expressed any issues with the recreation land, I have not reverted to Councillor Del Booth on this point. Even if there was evidence that neighbours had approached him, I do not accept that changes my finding in paragraph 7.7.

On the overlooking issue, I consider that the response made by Councillor Del Booth as set out in **Document 13** page 65 (see Sections 14 and 15) together with the photograph at **Document 14** fairly set out the overlooking position which I have verified from my site visit (see paragraph 5.1(k) above).

- 9.5 I thank Councillor Shannon for this response to the draft report. Overall I do not believe the points raised provide a basis for altering my findings and conclusions now expressed in this final report.

10 Finding

- 10.1 In accordance with paragraph 14(8)(a)(i) of the Standards Committee (England) Regulations 2008 I find that in respect of the matters which are the subject of this investigation Councillor Del Booth failed to comply with the code of conduct of Bromsgrove District Council by failing to declare a personal interest as required by paragraph 9 of the Code.
- 10.2 I further find that the personal interest did not amount to a prejudicial interest and he was not in breach of paragraph 12 of the code.



Signed:

Date: 29th February 2012

Appendix

Schedule of Documents

Case Reference: 1/2011

Doc No	Description	Pages
1	Allegation of breach of the code	2 - 4
2	Assessment Sub-Committee Report and decision)	5 - 13
3	Bromsgrove District Council – Code of Conduct	14 - 23
4	Note of meeting (Councillor S Shannon)	24 - 25
5	Article – Bromsgrove Advertiser	26 - 27
6	Report to Cabinet 5 th October 2011	28 - 37
7	Minutes of Cabinet Meeting 5 th October 2011	38 - 43
8	Land Registry Office Copy and files plan – 15 Housman Close	44 - 46
9	Plan of recreation land (appended to Cabinet report)	47
10	Report to Cabinet - December 2006 and minute	48 - 54
11	Plan – extent of Charford area for purpose of crime statistics	55
12	Zoopla search (house prices)	56 - 63
13	Answers to Questionnaire (Councillor D Booth)	64 - 66
14	Photo. No. 1 and Photo. No. 2	67
15	Response to draft report (Councillor Shannon)	68