

Comments on the facts

Harassment and distressed I believe the Clerk was harassed and distressed by the sequence of events at the meeting. Minutes of the planning meeting were unavailable, the Chair was not answering the questions and passed them to the Clerk, the Clerk was unable to supply documentation to substantiate answers, there were uncontrolled interruptions from Councillors, there was pressure on the Clerk regarding the confidentiality expressed by GUHG and the vociferous response from the MOP

2 Harassment and Bullying Seven witness statements do not corroborate with the allegations that I was responsible for harassment and bullying against 7 complainants that do. It is particularly refreshing to know that the Chair sitting next to the Clerk at the meeting, was one of those witnesses that denies the allegations

3 Apology offered to the Clerk because I genuinely felt sorry for the distress she was in. On reflection, I believe my apology was taken as an admission of guilt and any apology offered to the other members was unnecessary, but I considered it the gentlemanly thing to do (Give example)

4. The Clerk's interview with the author of the report describes a reasonably good relationship with me until the night in question having given her a glowing report in her appraisal. At the meeting the Clerk recognised my representation of local residents and their concerns and possibly for this reason attempted to answer my questions that I had addressed to the Chair during a 10 minute interval, although surprisingly this has now been changed in her WS to 20 minutes falling in line with one of the other witnesses. The third witness estimates an hour which is a little unrealistic considering the entire meeting only lasted 51 minutes.

5. Further disputes arise with one complainant imagined a Councillor was at the meeting when he was at home ill, another alleges much banging on the table and a third alleges I repeatedly made statements contrary to Council resolutions. I believe the 'resolution' that the councillor was referring to was a recommendation by the planning committee which certainly was not resolved or even debated at the FCM on the night in question. None of these allegations are recorded in the minutes and I suggest they are all perceptions and not facts. If I had requested a debate at FCM I believe it would have been acceptable on such a big issue.

6. two complainants suggest there are several coowners, yet the owner has confirmed in writing he is the sole owner with plans drawn up by developers and generally approved by CB Planning

7. There are allegations about me not following correct protocol, I would suggest that the Clerk answering for the Chair is just one example of the meeting not following correct protocol whereas my addressing Chair follows protocol to order. I was not alone in challenging the recommendation suggested by one councillor as eventually 40 parishioners objected to the site as against one in support as recorded at CB Planning

8. The Clerk's witness statement suggests that the planning application for the BRS had already been approved at the meeting but it was not passed by central Beds till May 2013

8. Finally, it is alleged I did not make decisions on merit. I consider the decision to represent a number of residents and their concerns on such a big issue was a very meritable decision. No other Councillor appeared to actively demonstrate or represent the wishes of the majority of the electorate regarding the IRS.