

Standards Sub-Committee

- The requirement for CBC to appoint a Standards Committee will no longer apply. Amongst other things, this means that the existing parish representatives who serve on that committee will no longer be in place
- The Council has considered arrangements for handling complaints relating to Members' conduct and serious allegations will be dealt with by way of hearings conducted by a Standards Sub-Committee. Consideration of minor, trivial or vexatious complaints will be left to the Monitoring Officer, in consultation with an independent person, and the early involvement of a Standards Sub-Committee will only occur in relation to the more serious complaints, such as those dealing with potential criminal conduct. The decision to involve a Sub-Committee at an early stage will be a matter for the Monitoring Officer in consultation with an independent person.
- A panel of Members from amongst the Council's General Purposes Committee's membership will be appointed and sub-committees will be appointed as and when required from this panel by the Monitoring Officer.
- Co-opted members will have no right to vote and that there is no automatic requirement for a town or parish council representative to take part when a Sub-Committee considers a complaint about a town or parish councillor.
- In respect of appointing an independent person the Monitoring Officers of Central Bedfordshire, Bedford, Luton and Milton Keynes Councils will appoint a joint panel of at least eight independent persons who would be available to undertake this role for any of the authorities. This appointments process is not yet complete.
- Technically, no sanctions are available to impose on a Member who is found to have breached the Code of Conduct, though four possible measures could be used, these being to:
 - Censure the Member
 - Publish the Sub-Committee's findings in respect of the Member's conduct
 - Report the Sub-Committee's findings to the town/parish council for information
 - Instruct the Monitoring Officer to (or recommend that the parish council) arrange training for the Member

Offences

- A councillor commits an offence if, without reasonable excuse, they fail to register a pecuniary interest, fail to disclose it at a meeting, take part in a discussion or get involved with the decision relating to it
- A person guilty of an offence is liable on summary conviction to a fine not exceeding level 5 (currently £5,000) on the standard scale and the court may disqualify the councillor from being or becoming a councillor for a period not exceeding five years

APPENDIX A.P. (2)

- e **Where the value of a contract is likely to exceed £138,893 (or other threshold specified by the Office of Government Commerce from time to time) the Council must consider whether the Public Contracts Regulations 2006 (SI No.5, as amended) and the Utilities Contracts Regulations 2006 (SI No. 6, as amended) apply to the contract and, if either of those Regulations apply, the Council must comply with EU procurement rules.**

30 Allegations of breaches of the code of conduct

- a On receipt of a notification that there has been an alleged breach of the code of conduct the Proper Officer shall refer it to a committee known as the Establishment committee. F.O.S.P.
- b Where the notification relates to a complaint made by the Proper Officer, the Proper Officer shall notify the Chairman of the Establishment committee of that fact, who, upon receipt of such notification, shall nominate a person to assume the duties of the Proper Officer set out in the remainder of this standing order, who shall continue to act in respect of that matter as such until the complaint is resolved.
- c Where a notification relates to a complaint made by an employee (not being the Proper Officer) the Proper Officer shall ensure that the employee in question does not deal with any aspect of the complaint.
- d The subject matter of notifications shall be confidential and, insofar as it is possible to do so by law, the Council (including the Proper Officer and the Chairman of the Establishment committee) shall take the steps set out below, together with other steps considered necessary, to maintain confidentiality.
 - i Draft the summonses and agendas in such a way that the identity and subject matter of the complaint are not disclosed.

- ii. Ensure that any background papers containing the information set out in standing order 31(a) above are not made public.
 - iii. Ensure that the public and press are excluded from meetings as appropriate.
 - iv. Ensure that the minutes of meetings preserve confidentiality.
 - v. Consider any liaison that may be required with the person or body with statutory responsibility for the investigation of the matter.
- e Standing order ^{30(d)?} 31(d) above should not be taken to prohibit the Council (whether through the Proper Officer or the Chairman of the Establishment committee or otherwise) from disclosing information to members and officers of the Council or to other persons where such disclosure is necessary to deal with the complaint or is required by law.
- f The Establishment committee shall have the power to:
- i. seek documentary and other evidence from the person or body with statutory responsibility for investigation of the matter;
 - ii. seek and share information relevant to the complaint;
 - iii. grant the member involved a financial indemnity in respect of legal costs, which shall be in accordance with the law and subject to approval by a meeting of the full Council.
- g References in standing order [?] 31 to a notification shall be taken to refer to a communication of any kind which relates to a breach or an alleged breach of the code of conduct by a councillor. ?
- CB Legal Dept.*

Cllr times will speak at End leave 1.45.

How should I address you?

APPENDIX AP 3

Request from Cllr Robinson to the Chair of the Public Hearing Panel 29th September 2014 and Seven Disputes (A - G) in Respect of facts in the Investigation Report

Request from Councillor Robinson AND HARASSMENT

Firstly, I request that this hearing agrees on the definition of Bullying which appears to be the most serious allegation of breaching the Northill Parish Code, 4.16. You will note that Harassment does appear in the Code, but I consider a definition of harassment also need to be defined.

Secondly, I request that this hearing deals only with the events of the 8th April 2013, including the background and the allegations of breaching the Northill Parish Council Code of Conduct 4.14, 4.15 and 4.16.

This is set out on Page 11 of the Agenda.

Thirdly, I request that any reference to allegations after the 8th April and not related to 4.14, 4.15 and 4.16 of the Northill Parish Council Code, be redacted at this hearing. This refers to the Agenda and the witness statements.

My reasons for making these requests, is that allegations regarding [redacted], further allegations by the Clerk and the Grievance Employment meeting, are or were, all separate investigations. Furthermore, I understand that the Central Beds Legal Department has no legal authority over the latter somewhat Draconian investigation and its resolution.

My defence document submitted on the 8th September 2014, Pages 91-101 in the Agenda, is mainly geared to the issues in paragraph 1 above. I have made references to post 8th April 2013 issues on Pages 99 - 101 in the Agenda, as these issues were brought up in the original complaints, Pages 21-48 in the Agenda.

Having received the complaint witness statements on the 24th September 2014, it is disturbing to find that at least half of the issues are completely unrelated to the allegations in the first paragraph above. Furthermore, there is additional detail and repeated allegations about [redacted].

Both complainants and the Council are aware, but do not appear to recognise, that [redacted] have been completely vindicated by a First Tier Tribunal on the 17th March 2014, of any alleged vexatious communication. The Tribunal... 'noted the parishioners' generally friendly tone and offers to help the Clerk'.... I would further add that the 2 year silencing of [redacted] imposed by Northill Parish Council continues to this day.

My other concern is that at the time of writing, 26th September 2014 8.22 hrs, I had not received the Clerk's witness statement and there was some doubt as to whether I can cross exam her due to an imposed ban by Northill Parish Council, preventing me from communicating with her.

I would ask if the defence witnesses may remain in the public gallery for the whole duration of the hearing. I regard this as being appropriate in order for witnesses to be fully informed of issues raised on the day, before they are called for questioning.

Finally, If there any concerns about my recent behaviour, I would refer you to the Witness statement of our present Chair.. 'since the decision of the Grievance Panel...his behaviour has been exemplary.

My thanks to you Mr/Madam Chairman, for allowing me to bring these concerns to the attention of yourself and the panel, prior to the commencement of the hearing.

Cllr Ian Robinson

HOB

1

you confirm to me

NOTHING TO DO WITH 8/4/13

I DO NOT UNDERSTAND WHY SO MUCH IS RELATED TO WHEN THEY HAVE BEEN VINDICATED

VERY LITTLE IN W/S REFER TO BOTH MAINLY UNRELATED ISSUES E.G.

BOTH HD/SAT refer to complaint by CLERK BUT original complaints refer to complaint by THEM.

Received 26/9/14

Prejudice my previous conduct

APPENDIX A (4)

Northhill Parish Council

Clerk to the council: Leanne Bacon, 55 Fairfield, Gamlingay, Beds, SG19 3LG

Tel - 01767 650477

Email - parishclerk@northhillparish.co.uk

NOTICE OF THE ANNUAL PARISH MEETING 2013

TO BE HELD AT CALDECOTE CHURCH ROOMS ON MONDAY 25TH MARCH AT 8PM

Councillors H Papworth and I Robinson will be available from 7.45pm for Councillors surgery.

Such persons only as are registered as local government electors for the parish will be entitled to vote at the meeting, but the meeting will be open to the public during the proceedings unless the Parish Meeting by resolution otherwise directs.

Dated this 18th day of March 2013.
D Milton - Chairman, Northhill Parish Council.

AGENDA

1. Apologies for absence
2. Minutes of Northhill Annual Parish Meeting held on 26th March 2012.
3. Matters Arising from Annual Parish Meeting held on 26th March 2012.
4. Annual Report from Chairman
5. Presentation by Mr R Uff - Principal Conservation Officer from Central Bedfordshire Council on requirements for archeological surveys in planning applications.
6. Affordable Housing - Recommendation from Planning Committee on new affordable housing site in Biggleswade Road. 25/3/13
7. Annual Financial Report - to receive audited accounts 2011-12.
8. Annual Report of Highways and Open Spaces Committee
9. Annual Report of Churchyard and Cemeteries Committee
10. Open Forum for 10 minutes.
11. Any Other Business

SUGGEST TO ME THAT NPC ITAD ALREADY DECIDED TO GO FOR BIGGLESWADE SITE ON 18/3/13.

This agenda and summons is published and provided, and may be used, only on the basis that the user assumes all responsibility for any loss, damage or consequence resulting directly or indirectly from it or its use. For the avoidance of doubt the only legally acceptable version of the Agenda of Northhill Parish Council is that kept by the Clerk. It is available for public inspection from the Clerk.

~~123~~

From: [REDACTED]
Sent date: 22/09/2014 - 22:06
To: d.robinson572@btinternet.com
Subject: 02/05/13 meeting

APPENDIX A(5)

Y/15

Hi Ian,

I can confirm that you asked Cllr Milton re whether the Chronicle letter in 18/4/13, was related or referring to you harassing the Clerk.

Cllr Milton replied no it didn't. The matter related to the Establishment meeting in February (where I allegedly harassed the Clerk).

Cheers,
-Jase

APPENDIX AP (6)

- 4.3 Members must not use the Council's resources improperly for personal or party political purposes.

Integrity

Definition — *lay open to disrepute
weaken one's principles*

- 4.4 Members must not do anything which compromises or is likely to compromise the impartiality of those who work for, or on behalf of, the Council. *See 4.2*

- 4.5 Members must not disclose information given to them in confidence. *: a grey area*

Objectivity

- 4.6 When making decisions on behalf of the Council, including awarding contracts or making appointments, Members must do so on merit.

- 4.7 Members must have regard to any relevant advice provided to them by the Clerk to the Council and (where a separate appointment is made) to the Responsible Financial Officer.

Accountability

- 4.8 Members must act in accordance with their legal obligations, including the following Acts of Parliament that confer special obligations on elected councillors:

Local Government Act 1972
Employment Rights Act 1996
Data Protection Act 1998
Freedom of Information Act 2000
Bribery Act 2010
Equality Act 2010
Localism Act 2011

*meeting protocol.
never been established*

- 4.9 Members must act in accordance with the Council's policies and reasonable requirements, including any protocols and codes of practice that may apply.

Openness

*• Voting on 25/3/13 - Bagg. Rd Site
• DM: article on 19/4/13 B. Chron.*

- 4.10 Members must give reasons for any decisions taken on behalf of the Council in accordance with any statutory requirements and the Council's Standing Orders.

- 4.11 Members must not prevent another person from gaining access to information to which that person is entitled by law.

E.g. Clerk's Application, contract etc

Honesty

- 4.12 Members must declare any disclosable (pecuniary and non-pecuniary) interests or conflicts of interest that may arise in respect of their responsibilities as a Member of the Council.

- 4.13 Members must at all times ensure that their claims for expenses, allowances, and their use of facilities and services provided by the Council are strictly in accordance with the rules laid down on these matters.

Central Beds Public Hearing 29/30 September

Investigating Officer's Submission Statement Representations on Breach of Code of Conduct

Appendix 7 RESPONSE TO THE STATEMENT BY CLLR ROBINSON

The original handwritten Submission is very difficult to read. Hopefully this typed version in black print (Statement) and responses by Cllr Robinson in purple italic print, with numbered paragraphs, is easier to follow. Uncertain wording of the submission is bracketed. References are made to the Agenda (Item 8 of the Public Hearing, the Public Hearing Report and (Appeal) Appendices. There is some duplication of comments in this Appendix with that of the main Appeal Document

Up to the day of the Hearing, Cllr Robinson was just defending his own integrity. He now feels justified in commenting on the Submission Statement and the complainants' advantage of having the services of a professional solicitor free of costs, while denied similar representation with no costs to him. He considers that together with the Complaint Investigation Report, these issues had a major influence on the Public Hearing's Conclusion.

1. Cllr Robinson considers this Submission fails to give a balanced and accurate view of events, in that no reference is made to the Minutes of the meeting of the 8/4/13, the interview with the Clerk, 5 defence letters and the views of Martin Leppert, the Independent Person. Agenda P 97.

2. Extracts from the defence letters and from the Independent Person -

a) Agenda P 59 Defence witness John Davies states... 'The Chair should have stopped the harassment by two other councillors who verbally attacked the speaker (Cllr Robinson)'

b) Agenda P 64 John Davies... 'Then she (the Clerk) leant across the table and pointed her finger at his (Cllr Robinson's) chest... After that, several Councillors verbally abused Mr Robinson and the Chair tried to usher him out'

c) Agenda P 107 Jason Henegan ... 'The Clerk waving her fingers at a Councillor (Robinson) is a sight many have not seen before....'

d) Agenda P 69 Martin Leppert... 'I do not think that Cllr Robinson should shoulder all the blame as it would appear he felt he was being obstructed in getting appropriate action from the Parish Council'.

3. . The Submission continually refers to 'a line had been crossed' regarding Cllr Robinson, yet pays little attention to the rudeness, occasionally extreme, levelled at Cllr Robinson, as shown above

The findings of the Investigation Report are that Cllr Robinson did breach the Northill Parish Council Code of Conduct. The parts of the code breached are set out: 4.14 Members must set an example by their behaviour and shall act in a way that enhances public trust and confidence in the integrity of the Council and its members. 4.15 Members must show respect and courtesy to others. 4.16 Members should value the Council's officers and work alongside them to achieve the Council's objectives. Members must on no account behave in a manner that might constitute bullying.

a) Apart from a public sanction and a request for a public apology, the conclusion from the Public Hearing was the same as the Investigating Officer's recommendation in June 2014, Agenda P 18

c) Cllr Robinson fails to understand why the Investigating Officer did not refer to this extraordinary call for a Hearing in her Submission Statement, since a Public Hearing is usually reserved for complaints of a potential criminal nature. Appendix AP 1

5. In making representations on the Code of Conduct, I have dealt with 4.14 and 4.15 together. When the new Code of Conduct was introduced under the Localism Act of 2011, there was no guidance issued with new regulations. So it is necessary to look at the former Standards Board for (established guidance?) which was applied to the former national model code

6. You must treat councillors with respect.

Cllr Robinson questions why the Submission does not refer to Cllr Dawson shouting at Cllr Robinson to 'Stop Grandstanding' on the 8/4/13, Agenda P 86 and the same Councillor calling Cllr Robinson a 'Pr-t' twice at the APM on the 31/3/14? The fact that the Chair did not rebuke Cllr Dawson on either occasion, nor did any Councillor in attendance, including Cllr Turner, consider it necessary to complain, would suggest that Cllr Robinson is treated somewhat differently. Witness statement re 31/3/14 Agenda P 121

7. Northhill (Parish Council's) Code of Conduct is sufficiently similar to this provision of the former (national?) model code to make the Standards Board (guidance?) of relevance here. That guidance expresses the view that a clear line must be drawn between the requirement to show respect to others and the freedom to disagree with their views and opinions. The evidence you heard yesterday was that line had already been crossed.

Why was it considered that Cllr Dawson had not crossed the line? Cllr Robinson considers that his language at the APM was a serious breach of the Northhill Parish Council Code of Conduct 4.14 Agenda P 51.

You heard the evidence of Leanne Bacon, Sally Mandley (and) Helen Papworth, but in the Investigation Report, the complaints of all 7 complainants are set out in full. Reference to some of the comments:

8. He refused to let one Councillor speak by insisting that he had not finished.

Cllr Robinson was interrupted by Cllr Dawson shouting, and asked the Chair to be allowed to finish.

9. He loudly and repeatedly questioned the Clerk and the Chair, despite having already received perfectly adequate answers.

The Clerk was unable to provide adequate answers Agenda P 86 ...'Clerk explained ...that she did not have a copy of the correspondence to hand'

10. ...he did not stop talking even (though) requested to by the Chair and monopolised the proceedings.

The Chair did not intervene as confirmed in the Public Hearing Report, Findings of Facts 9.1.10...'The Chairman did not stop Cllr Robinson's questions'

11. He quickly became loud and aggressive raising his voice and demanding to be allowed to finish. At times he banged his hand on the table.

None of these false allegations have been confirmed in the Public Hearing Report, Findings of Fact Section 9.

12. Cllr Robinson was unstoppable, raising his voice to overcome the Chair's voice...he did not allow others the courtesy of (allowing others) the courtesy of what they were saying.

Cllr Robinson raised his voice so that all attendees could hear and because of the poor acoustics in the room, the Chair did not intervene and the other Councillors were simply shouting Cllr Robinson down as witnessed above in 2a

13. He was loud and aggressive, impolite to others and disdainful of the requirements of courtesy and impartiality.

Again, these false allegations are not confirmed in the Public Hearing Report, Findings of Fact, Section 9

14. The fact that 6 Councillors and the Clerk left the meeting and wrote to the Monitoring Officer immediately to complain, suggests to me that the line between showing respect to others and disagreeing with a decision and views of others, had clearly been crossed. *Please refer to NATURE OF REPORTING THE COMPLAINT, Appeal Document, Section 2.*

15. A large number of people attended the Parish Council (meeting) on the evening because of their concern over the Affordable Housing application They all witnessed the behaviour of Cllr Robinson' erratic and inappropriate behaviour and lost the opportunity to see and (?) on the Affordable Housing decision. They were there to see if Northill (Parish Council) would uphold the Planning Committee's decision ...but the meeting had to be abandoned.

a) This description of the meeting conveys a false impression that the members of the public in attendance were disdainful of Cllr Robinson's alleged inappropriate behaviour. This impression is entirely false, since the attendees, most of who were against the Affordable Housing application, were appalled at the manner in which the meeting was conducted.

b) The lack of acknowledgement by the Chair and the Councillors, to the written presentation by Mrs Randle, opposing the application of behalf of about 40 parishioners, conveyed the impression that Northill Parish Council does not wish to listen to its electorate.

16. From evidence we heard yesterday, clearly there was some misunderstanding about the rules of procedure. There was clearly an expectation that members of the public and Cllr Robinson could get the matter referred back for further consideration. *Please refer to EVIDENCE NOT APPARENTLY FULLY CONSIDERED AT THE HEARING, INCLUDING FRESH EVIDENCE in the Appeal Document, Section 6*

17. Chairman as you yourself are very aware, planning decisions give rise to a lot of different views and opinions and people do get emotional about development close to their homes. Debates do get heated. I have sat next to you in meetings where you have had to issue a warning that you would clear the room and adjourn the meeting if the public did not calm down and listen to the debate.

a) The above paragraphs demonstrate and confirm the concerns that the electorate had for the application. However, the electorate has still not had a proper explanation for the reasons of developing the Biggleswade Road site against the wishes of the Parish, the Parish Council and the assurances given by John Goody from Central Beds, Appendix AP 8

b) It would appear that Northill Parish Council have spent over 18 months in trying to punish and or remove Cllr Robinson from office, for asking persistent yet pertinent questions. They are persistent because they still have not been answered.

18. However taking these both these points as mitigating factors, a line had been crossed with regard to public trust and integrity of the Council and there was clearly a lack of respect and courtesy from Cllr Robinson about how he responded to the Chair, Clerk and his fellow Councillors, who were also entitled to express their views, explain the procedure, get the business of the evening completed.

a) Cllr Robinson considers that public trust and integrity of the Council was brought about by the Council itself in the way the Chair allowed the meeting to be disorderly on the 8/4/13

b) Cllr Robinson always addressed the Chair so comments regarding responding to the Clerk are invalid. Any suggested dialogue between the Clerk and Cllr Robinson was in fact a one way monologue, as the defence witness letters and witness statements support.

c) Regarding getting the business of the evening completed. Much has been said regarding the adjournment of the meeting disallowing a debate on the application. It was made clear at the hearing that a decision had been made to approve the application using the alleged authority of the planning committee.

d) Since 6 months is required before rescinding a decision, any further business would not permit debate on the application. If the Chair had explained this to the meeting, it might have prevented the disorder that followed.

19. I would also draw your (personal?) attention to the very measured comments and evidence of Cllr Turner. I know that Cllr Turner has sat through very heated and often highly political debates in CBC Council Chamber and has chaired heated planning committees, but she is of the opinion that a line has been crossed and felt it necessary to write to the Monitoring Officer the next day to bring my attention to the events of Northill Parish Council

a) Cllr Turner might have considered using her vast experience in advising the Clerk and Councillors of the protocol for making a complaint. Her contribution in preventing a rush to a formal complaint to the Monitoring Office instead of following the Standing Orders, would have been a calming influence and brought about a suitable resolution to the matter within the confines of the Parish Council.

Please refer to NATURE OF REPORTING A COMPLAINT, Appeal Document, Section 2

b) Cllr Robinson has spoken with Cllr Turner on several occasions regarding the Affordable Housing issues and there have been amicable disagreements about the procedure for choosing the site and the allocation of units.

c) Cllr Turner should be aware of the meeting on the 17/9/12, where both John Goody from Central Beds and Geoff Evans from GUHG, stated that the Parish would choose the site and the units would be allocated to those residents with a local connection to the Parish of Northill. **Appendix AP 8**

d) However, despite this recorded assurance, the site was not chosen by the Parish and there has been a change in the ruling for allocation of units whereby units can be allocated outside the Parish.

20 She acknowledges the energy and enthusiasm of Cllr Robinson and has taken time herself personally to guide him through procedure and pass on her years of experience on how to get things done and achieve your objectives without upsetting everyone but acknowledges that in a planning arena, the democratic process must be followed.

a) Cllr Robinson does not recall any advice given by Cllr Turner on procedure issues within the Parish Council.

b) The inappropriate comment about 'upsetting everyone' conveys to others, including the panel, that Cllr Robinson is a serial trouble maker. Amongst other matters Councillors, are elected to ask questions on behalf of the electorate.

c) Cllr Robinson has noticed that unpopular questions including FOI requests are often perceived as time wasting, vexatious, harassing or even bullying by the Clerk. He has even been told by the Clerk in refusing his reasonable FOI questions, that he may be suffering from memory loss or should consider his position as a Councillor.

d) Regarding courtesy, Cllr Robinson questions if the Clerk has crossed the line in this unpleasant response and he is disappointed that the Submission Statement or the Hearing does not refer to this distasteful communication even though it is found in the **Agenda P 118**

21. With regard to the complaint about bullying the Clerk. We have heard evidence that the conduct of Cllr Robinson and questioning of the Clerk on the evening, so I do not need to go over that again at this point, but we have heard that this is not a one off.

a) Cllr Robinson has found it necessary to comment on issues unrelated to the 8/4/13 in this document, since they are raised in this submission and very much so at the Hearing.

b) However, it is considered unjust that so much attention is given to these other issues, since Cllr Robinson was totally unprepared to defend these allegations at the hearing

22. There have been other occasions in which Cllr Robinson has undermined the Clerk at meetings (for) example, questioning over the balance of the accounts, expecting information that could only be achieved with a bank reconciliation exercise being carried out, but no notice of this was given.

a) Cllr Robinson, sitting in the public gallery, again directed his questions to the Chair at the APM on the 31/3/14 where a Financial Report was to be given. A parishioner asked for an approximate figure of the total balances and was given an unrealistic figure.

b) Another parishioner asked a financial question, followed by Cllr Robinson. The Clerk was unable to give an answer. Considering the APM was to include a financial report, Cllr Robinson considers that the questions were most acceptable and to suggest the Clerk was being undermined, is another very questionable allegation.

c) If the Clerk cannot give an approximate figure of the balances during a financial report, something is fundamentally wrong. This is another example of where the Clerk was unprepared, but accuses Cllr Robinson of undermining her authority

d) No complaint was made against [REDACTED] or against Cllr Dawson for calling Cllr Robinson a 'Pr-t'. The pattern of treating Cllr Robinson differently from Councillors continues.

23. Leanne Bacon is a very professional and able Parish Clerk who takes her responsibilities and duties very seriously, however she has found it necessary because of the behaviour of one Councillor, to raise a number of grievances against Northill Parish Council as her employer and in 11 out of 14 grievances issues her views have been upheld by the Grievance Panel. *Please refer to FRESH EVIDENCE SINCE THE HEARING in the Appeal Document Section 7*

24. Cllr Robinson's conduct has been such that even during these proceedings, Northill Parish Council as employer has been concerned to protect her from (the) behaviour of Cllr Robinson. They clearly know how he would behave towards their Clerk. *Please refer to THE MANNER AND PROCEDURE OF THE MEETING in the Appeal Document Section 5 e, f & g*

25. Chair, something further which I would like you to take into account. Parish Council meetings only occur once a month. The Clerk works three days a week and more probably she has had to deal with correspondence and calls from Cllr Robinson, until the Grievance Panel, have stopped all contact and correspondence, that itself speaks volumes.

a) Cllr Robinson considers that part of the duties of the Clerk requires correspondence with Councillors on matters of Council business. Cllr Robinson had found that any question to the Clerk received an unhelpful, negative, or unpleasant response. E.g Agenda P 118

b) However, questions now directed to the Chair, as resolved by the Grievance Panel, are answered promptly and fully by the Chair. This suggests that the three days probably answering Cllr Robinson's questions are grossly exaggerated.

c) Cllr Robinson has only made one telephone call to the Clerk during his nearly 5 years term of office and the picture painted above of Cllr Robinson telephoning the Clerk is complete fabrication.

d) If this allegation was not made by the Clerk, Cllr Robinson would be appalled if this completely untrue comment was accepted by the Panel.

e) This totally false allegation and many others appearing in this Submission together with all the other accusations made in formal complaints and in witness statements have been presented to the Panel.

f) The submission by the Investigating Officer in Cllr Robinson's opinion, should contain information from the Defence Witnesses.

g) Since the Submission Statement clearly only deals with the Complaint Witnesses, the Panel, having regard for the Investigating Officer as a professional solicitor is required to make a just and reasonable judgement on Cllr Robinson's character and behaviour, when studying the Submission.

h) Although Cllr Robinson appreciates that many of these allegations have been dismissed by the Panel, he feels that the fact the complaints have been made by 8 people in public office from the same Parish Council all witnessing the same event, has publicly tainted his character by a formidable degree.

i) Having determined that Cllr Robinson was allegedly guilty of breaching the code, the Investigating Officer was able to represent all the complainants at the hearing at no costs to the complainants.

j) Although Cllr Robinson was given the services of a professional Independent Person, the person could only act in an advisory capacity and the request to represent Cllr Robinson at the hearing was denied.

k) Cllr Robinson could have employed a professional lawyer, but the costs and time to fully appreciate the nature of the issue, compared with the knowledge gained by the Investigating Officer over 18 months and then acting for the complainants, prohibited this line of action

l) Cllr Robinson therefore considers that the services of a professional solicitor given to the complainants, gave them an unfair advantage.

m) A professional submission for the defence and professional cross examining of the complaint witnesses might have changed the conclusion of the panel.

30. If the allegations of Breach of code of Conduct are upheld, the Monitoring Officer will give guidance on the sanctions available to the sub committee. It is hoped that a suitable resolution can be found to move forward. This is clearly an ambitious and well run Parish Council and it needs to be able to get on with its business with public trust.

32. Cllr Robinson is not quite sure what the complainants aim to gain by an apology in public apart from undeserving humiliation and possibly a backfire from the electorate when the truth of the evening of the 8/4/13 becomes a public reality.

APPENDIX AP(8)

Notes of an Affordable Housing Public Meeting held on 17th September 2012 at Caldecote Lower School hall - 7.30 -9.10pm.

In attendance: Northill Parish Council (NPC) - Chairman D Milton, Vice Chairman H Papworth and Clerk L Bacon. Central Bedfordshire Council (CBC) - Principal Housing Development Officer J Goody and S Robinson. Grand Union Housing Group (GUHG) - G Evans and N Hillier. 57 members of the public.

H Papworth introduced attendees and explained the purpose of the meeting – to gain feedback from Northill parishioners on proposed sites for an affordable housing development.

A need for 22 affordable houses was identified by a Housing Needs Survey of the parish.

Northill Parish Council supports the concept of providing affordable housing within the parish to meet this need but has to be satisfied that the location is suitable. CBC will not support the development of a site that is not supported by NPC.

“Exception site policy” was explained – affordable housing can be built outside the normal development envelope.

Local Lettings Policy was explained – giving precedent to local people in allocation of housing on exception sites with cascading order of priority.

Comments/queries/responses:

1. 10 houses required in Upper Caldecote, 4 in Ickwell.
2. Majority of housing will be exempt from “right to buy” scheme.
3. Sites were initially assessed against CBC Core Strategy – some sites were found to have serious issues e.g. flooding. At this stage some landowners had not been identified or approached.
4. NPC has sought and received assurance in writing that CBC will require NPC support before progressing with any particular site. Some members of the public doubted that this would be the case.
5. CBC would continue to search for sites if none of those identified so far were considered suitable, but there are limited options in the locality. Affordable housing need would not be met outside the parish as more local families would take priority.
6. Affordable housing developments devalue surrounding properties – GUHG contested this.
7. Parishioners requiring/currently residing in affordable housing were in attendance and related positive experiences living in affordable housing.
8. Could smaller sites be considered as more acceptable in rural setting – 1 or 2 houses? GUHG – not financially viable, minimum would be 4-5 units.
9. Traffic – concerns expressed about increased road use/parking. GUHG – may not be substantial impact as some potential affordable housing residents may already be living/driving/parking in the parish but currently living with parents/family.
10. Exception site would create “exclusions” rather than “inclusions” and 10 units together can be like a “ghetto”. The parish should see some benefit in return for