

Central Beds Public Hearing 29/30 September 2014

Defence Document/8 April 2013/Cllr Ian Robinson

The Central Beds Monitoring Office advised that any defence documents should be received by the Monitoring Office on or before 8 September 2014.

This **Defence Document/8 April 2013/Cllr Ian Robinson**, referred to as **Document**, together with the appendices as separate pages is requested to be given to each member of the Public Hearing Panel, including the Central Beds Clerk and the Central Beds Legal Officer assisting the Panel.

The Document is Cllr Robinson's response to the complaints in the **Complaints Investigation Report 6 June 2014**, referred to as **Report**. The majority of Cllr Robinson's comments refer to the complaints of 8/4/13 on pages 1-10. Further comments from Cllr Robinson, not directly related to the 8/4/13, are on Page 11.

No.s 1-7 and Appendices A-T refer to the Report and Y1-Y14 appendices, refer to the Document. References to page No.s are to this Document unless otherwise stated.

Contents

Background history. Outline of the evening of 8/4/13	Page 2
Response to 1 - Summary of complaints against Cllr Robinson	Page 3
Response to 2 - Corroboration of issues by complainants	Page 3
Grouping of 3 - Alleged breaches of the Code of Conduct	Page 4
Response to alleged breaches above: Details of the evening of 8/4/13 & Grouping on Page 4	Page 5
Response to 4 – Consultation with the Independent Person	Page 6
Response to 5 and 6 - Comments from complainants on the Draft Report. Conclusion	Page 6
Comments from the Minutes, interview and correspondence	Page 7
Conclusion from Cllr Robinson	Page 8
Appendices Y1-Y14	Page 10
Cllr Robinson's response to complaints unrelated to 8/4/13	Page 11

Facts & factual comments are in Black print and/or underlined

Perceptions, opinions and fictional comments are in *Italic Purple Print*

Background history The events leading up to the evening of the 8/4/13, were that both Northill Parish Council and the parish residents, had chosen one of two Affordable Housing sites in Upper Caldecote. Since both Council and parish residents did not wish to see both sites developed in Upper Caldecote, the first choice site was on Ickwell Road. However, as a result of a Council Planning committee recommendation at a meeting on the 25/3/13, the Council resolved to support a Central Beds planning application for the second choice site on Biggleswade Road. The Planning meeting fuelled village resident anger, in that copies of the planning application for the Biggleswade Road site were only available at the start of the Planning meeting. Also, the Clerk appeared to control the meeting, despite the Chair of the Planning Committee being present.

It needs to be emphasised that the Biggleswade Road site was not the second choice site of the **Village of Upper Caldecote**. Nearly 40 village residents considered this site to be beset with material problems and were concerned that the reasons for the developers not to progress with the Ickwell Road site had not been fully explained or debated. However, the Clerk sent the planning recommendation to Central Beds Planning the same evening, thus removing the opportunity for the application to be fully considered by the public before the next Full Council meeting on the 8/4/13.

In an Email from GUHG, the developers, had already confirmed in December 2012, its decision not to progress with the chosen site. Yet, according to the site owner, plans had been drawn up for this site and GUHG had stated that it might eventually develop both sites in the village. Furthermore, Emails from GUHG, in January 2013, made it abundantly clear that certain information **was not for the public domain, APPENDIX Y1**. Although these decisions were confirmed in the Council Newsletter in the Winter of 2012/2013, no detailed explanation was publicised and remains so until the present time. Several days before the meeting on the 8/4/13, the Ickwell Road site owner made a written statement to Cllr Robinson, confirming that he had always been willing to sell his site and would match any offers on other sites. Furthermore, according to the owner, his site had been identified and approved by CUHG and Central Beds Planning, **APPENDIX Y2**.

Outline of the evening of 8/4/13 An objection document representing the concerns of nearly 40 village residents, relating to the Biggleswade Road site, was presented to a Council meeting on the 8/4/13. In addition, Cllr Robinson considered that it was his duty to bring the statement from the Ickwell Road site owner, to the Council's attention and request an explanation of why this preferred site was not being progressed.

However, the meeting failed to follow protocol in a number of ways. **Firstly**, there was no debate on the objection document and the Minutes from the Planning meeting were unavailable. **Secondly**, the Chair was unable to answer Cllr Robinson's questions and passed them on to the Clerk. **Thirdly**, the Clerk was permitted to respond and only partly answered the questions and dismissed both the questions and statement as being irrelevant. **Fourthly**, there were uncontrolled interruptions from Councillors. **Fifthly**, the Chair failed to advise or explain to the public, the reason for the requested confidentiality of the matter from GUHG. **Sixthly**, the chair did not express any concern to the public, that GUHG had gone against the wishes of both Council and village residents, **Lastly**, the Clerk walked out and the Chair abandoned the meeting.

Response to 1. Summary of complaints against Cllr Robinson

All seven complaints refer to the **Nolan Principle of Leadership**. This Principle is related to events that allegedly took place whilst Cllr Robinson was questioning the Chair at a meeting of Northill Parish Council on the 8/4/13. Three complaints refer **only** to Leadership. Four complaints refer to five other Nolan principles, **APPENDIX H**. Four Councillors make further complaints not directly related to the 8/4/13.

Response to 2. Corroboration of issues by complainants

2.1 Although the individual complaints are generally corroborated regarding the 8/4/13, there are glaring differences in the detail. The alleged time of Cllr Robinson's questions and statement to the Chair, varies from 10 minutes, **APPENDIX I**, to one hour, **APPENDICES D & E**, but the meeting only lasted 51 minutes, **APPENDIX T**. The Clerk's interview with the Investigating Officer mentions Cllr Robinson's apology and glowing report of the Clerk and of her recommendation of a Councillor Training Course, which Cllr Robinson subsequently attended, **APPENDIX I**.

2.2 The 7 complaints are detailed in **APPENDICES A to G**, and grouped on **Page 4**.

2.2.1 The alleged Email from Sam Vernon does not appear in the Appendices. **APPENDIX K** is actually a letter written by **John Davies** to the Biggleswade Chronicle in April 2013. This was forwarded by Sam Vernon to Nick Pearce and then forwarded again to John Atkinson. **John Davies** also wrote another support letter to John Atkinson on the 25/9/13 **APPENDIX L**.

There are also detailed accounts that do not corroborate with the detail of the complaints. These are the Minutes of the meeting, **APPENDIX T**, the interview with the Clerk on the 1/10/13, **APPENDIX I** and correspondence from **Jill Parker**, **APPENDIX Y3** **Jean Cordy**, **APPENDIX Y4** and **APPENDIX Y5**. Extracts from these accounts can be found on **Page 7** of this Defence Document.

2.2.2 **Cllr Robinson comments as follows** - I pay respect to the experience of Alan Bigg and I consider his observations to be fairly accurate. However these issues, big or small, are still important because they sometimes have been raised by parish residents at previous meetings. *Councillors often appear disinterested in following up these matters. Alan Bigg might remember that under the previous Chairman*, much more time was allowed for constructive debate and challenging questions. My memories of Cllr Milton would be of keeping a close scrutiny on things by numerous questions to the previous Chair.

Mr Bigg, being a resident of Northill, has not personally experienced the trauma of some residents in the proposed development in Upper Caldecote. If he had carefully noted that David Milton, the Chairman, was not leading the meeting and was failing to answer the questions relating to a very big issue, *he might have expressed different views*. I am also surprised that Mr Bigg's previous experience of meeting protocol did not lead him to question the role of both the Clerk and Chair during the questioning.

Grouping of 3. Alleged breaches of the Code of Conduct (Ref 3.1.1, 3.1.2, 3.1.3 in the Report) and APPENDICES A to G complaints made by Councillors. Complaints are grouped according to Cllr Robinson's views. Similar complaints are not listed.

FACTS (black print)	PERCEPTIONS	OPINIONS
Disorder Meeting abandoned Clerk walked out Residents were unhappy	<i>Repeatedly made statements contrary to previous resolutions</i>	<i>Bringing Council into disrepute Harassment and bullying Breached NPC Code of Leadership The Clerk APPENDIX A</i>
Clerk distressed Apology made Pointed at Councillor Said ' what's his name' Not accept Clerk's answers Disagreed with resolutions Reconsider application Disgraceful proceedings	<i>Refused to let anyone speak Talking for 20 minutes Out of control Hostile questioning to Clerk Prevented Chair from chairing Prevented others from speaking</i>	<i>Erratic & inappropriate behaviour Playing to the audience Apology unacceptable Disregarded Standing Orders Disgraceful behaviour Cllr Papworth APPENDIX B</i>
	<i>Received adequate answers</i>	<i>Failed to set an example Behaviour might be excused Aggressive performance Cllr Kay APPENDIX C</i>
Clerk nearly tears Cannot bring documents to support this	<i>An hour long rant Made faces and glared Ad hominem attacks on Clerk</i>	<i>Failed to value Council's Officer I Agrees with right to raise questions Belittled two Councillors Disrespectful to the Chair Cllr Momen APPENDIX D</i>
(Asked) to be allowed to finish Three other members had their hands up Have not attached any documents	<i>Banged hand on table Gesticulating to Clerk, Chairman & other members shouting them down Talking for about one hour Chair attempted to break into tirade (of Cllr Robinson) Raised his voice Despite being asked did not cease his rant</i>	<i>Failed to regard protocol Cllr Mandley APPENDIX E</i>
	<i>Talked over the responses of the Clerk</i>	<i>Cllr Wilcox APPENDIX F</i>
Does not acknowledge that Resolutions are not open to further discussion		<i>Cllr Bennett APPENDIX G</i>

Response to 3. Alleged breaches of the Code Conduct: Details of the evening of 8/4/13 outlined on Page 2 & Grouping on Page 4

FACTS These are taken from the FACT column on **Page 4**, the Minutes of the meeting, **APPENDIX T** and Cllr Robinson's observations. The facts are corroborated by the correspondence in the **Report Page 2**, the Independent person, the **Report Page 5** and the conclusion by the Investigating Officer, the **Report Page 7**. Also, this **Document Page 7**.

Some village residents were unhappy with the Council's recommendation of the Biggleswade Road site and presented the Council with 13 copies of an objection document listing the reasons for the material objections to this site, **APPENDIX T**. The documents were not acknowledged by the Chair.

Later in the meeting during 'Matters Arising', I asked the Chair to explain why the Ickwell Road site was not being progressed, but the Chair passed the question to the Clerk. I advised the meeting of the willingness of the owner to sell his site and according to the owner, the positive response from the developers and Central Beds Planning. Members of the public then witnessed the disgraceful proceedings that followed, including interruptions from Councillors and poor control by the Chair. After partly responding to the questions and statement and dismissing them both, the Clerk later walked out, **APPENDIX T**. *The Chair did not have to abandon the meeting and the Vice Chair could have recorded the Minutes after the Clerk walked out.*

The unrepresentative decision to recommend a different site was not fully explained or discussed. The new, possibly confidential statement, that I presented to the meeting, **APPENDIX Y2**, caused the Clerk to be distressed and possibly harassed. *I deny that I was personally responsible for causing either distress or harassment and I consider the accusation of bullying to be outrageous.*

Pointing at Cllr Kay was not intended to be offensive in any way and I asked another Councillor 'what's your name' as I had genuinely forgotten it, being accustomed to calling him Tony. Furthermore, the comment served as a little light relief during his interruption. Cllr Kay did not personally complain and the other Councillor was not one of the official complainants. I asked the Chair to be allowed to finish as I was getting interruptions from Councillors although they had their hands up. A verbal apology was made to the Clerk immediately after the meeting and later by Email to the Councillors. None of the complainants had evidence to support their claims of my allegedly breaking the Councillor Code of Conduct.

PERCEPTIONS, Page 4. *I deny all these fictional allegations.* I repeat that the whole meeting only lasted 51 minutes and there is no reference to the allegations in the Minutes **APPENDIX T**

OPINIONS, Page 4. *I deny most of these opinions.* The comments from Cllr Kay - '(Cllr Robinson's) Behaviour might be excused' and those of Cllr Momen - 'agrees with Cllr Robinson's right to question' lessen the quality of the complaints. Also, since most of the Report is in reference to my approximate 10 minute questioning on the 8/4/13, *it would suggest that it has been somewhat inappropriate to take the complaints to Public Hearing. I completely deny the allegation that I have brought the Council into disrepute. On the contrary, I believe the seven failings mentioned at the bottom of page 2 were the main cause of bringing the Council into disrepute.*

Response to 4. Consultation with the Independent Person:

Martin Leppert refers to Cllr Robinson's apology after the meeting and subsequently attending a Councillor Training Course as mitigation for any alleged actions. Mr Leppert also notes that... *'the history leading up to the meeting, the manner it which was conducted and controlled, all helped to bring about this rather unsatisfactory event...'* **APPENDIX N**

Response to 5. Comments from the complainants on Draft report

Cllr Robinson has responded to many of these comments earlier **on Page 5**. The support from Mr Davies is based on his observations and not because of a common concern. **APPENDIX O**.

Response to 6. Conclusions (by the Investigating Officer)

Cllr Robinson's comments

The Investigating Officer's comments corroborate those of the witnesses on **Page 7**. I did take the opportunity to direct questions to the Chair, not the Clerk. The questions were repeated because appropriate answers were not forthcoming from the Chair. I felt uncomfortable because the meeting was not following correct protocol in that the Clerk had been asked to address me on the Chair's behalf. The accusations by the Clerk of being harassed and bullied are invalid for a number of reasons.

Firstly the questions were directed to the Chair, not the Clerk.

Secondly, the questions were perceived as being insistent or harassing. The questions were calmly repeated, through necessity, and then followed up with a statement from the owner of the Ickwell Road site. In my opinion, *the statement caught the whole meeting off guard*, because the reason for not progressing the Ickwell Road site was not for the public domain. This put the Clerk and the Councillors in an awkward position. *One could even suggest a harassed position.*

Thirdly, although it is likely that the clerk was harassed, which in the context of the allegation means being troubled or worried. There is a difference in meaning between **'Cllr Robinson allegedly harassed (troubled) the Clerk'** and **'The Clerk was harassed (troubled) by being put in a awkward position'** or as one witness stated... *'The Clerk was left out to dry'*.

Lastly, it is inconceivable that the Clerk was allegedly bullied. This means to be hurt, frightened or browbeaten. To suggest that the Clerk was at the receiving end of a bully, that is myself, is a serious and outrageous accusation.

While accepting the spirit of the Investigating Officer's conclusion, *I do not consider I have been broken any aspect of the Councillor Code of Conduct.* However, I have always supported the recommendation to resume normal Council business as opposed to continuing internal disputes. The words of Martin Leppert on the updated report echoes this sentiment **APPENDIX S**.

Comments from Minutes, interview and correspondence re 8/3/13

Minutes of the Council meeting 8/4/13 - 'IR (Cllr Robinson 9.1 asked clerk to detail the various responses from relevant parties to query why the Ickwell Road site had not been progressed. Clerk explained that she had circulated all responses to councillors, but did not have a copy of the correspondence to hand...he had spoken to the landowner of the Ickwell Rd (site) who indicated to him that they are prepared to sell the land....council should reconsider the resolution made by the planning committee...Clerk responded this is unfortunately irrelevant' **APPENDIX T2.**

Mrs Leanne Bacon, Clerk. Taken from an interview with the Investigating Officer – 'Until the parish Council meeting of 8th April 2013, she felt that she had a reasonably good relationship with Cllr Robinson. (Referring to the meeting on 8/4/13) the Clerk to the Council took over answering the questions and there followed a quite heated and animated exchange between the Clerk and Cllr Robinson. This continued for about 10 minutes until the Clerk walked out...' **APPENDIX I.**

John Davies Ex Clerk—'The Chair should have answered the questions raised by Cllr Robinson without bringing the Clerk into the debate and should have stopped the harassment of at least two other councillors who verbally attacked the speaker' (Cllr Robinson) **APPENDIX K** – 'the Clerk took over answering the questions although they were addressed to the chair...although Cllr Robinson may have been hard and insistent with his questioning he was getting increasingly frustrated that the Clerk, not the Chair was answering his questions and not giving answers to the questions he was raising.' **APPENDIX L.**

Jill Parker parishioner, – 'Cllr Robinson asked for more detailed clarification on a particular matter, and Chairman then requested the Parish Clerk,, Mrs Leanne Bacon, to provide more information. She did so by answering Cllr Robinson direct. He addressed another question to the Chairman who again asked the Clerk to clarify. She again, directed her answer to Cllr Robinson instead of normal protocol which would be to reply to the Chairman...At no time, to my knowledge, did Cllr Robinson address any questions direct to the Clerk...Cllr Robinson requested more detail on the subject, he was enquiring about, the Clerk began to speak, then arose from her seat and left the room.' **APPENDIX Y3.**

Jean Cordy, parishioner, – *'The Chair allowed the secretary (Clerk) to run the meeting which in any forum is not the role of the secretary. The overriding impression is that the secretary had ideas above her station and not least a complete lack of interest in our case...'* **APPENDIX Y4.**

██████████, parishioner, - *'It was not (Cllr) Robinson that has brought the council into disrepute – on the contrary, it was the way the Chairman, Clerk and other members of the council behaved by acting as they have, that has brought the a feeling of no confidence in the Parish council and has brought itself into disrepute. Many onlookers were appalled at the chairman for not chairing the meeting and astonished that the clerk seems to call the shots in certain discussions.'* **APPENDIX Y5.**

Martin Leppert, Independent Person, reviewed the complaints and relevant papers – *'I do not think Cllr Robinson should shoulder all the blame as it would appear he felt he was being obstructed in getting appropriate information from the parish Council.'* **APPENDIX N.**

Conclusion from Cllr Ian Robinson Cllr Robinson has responded to the alleged breaches of the Code of Conduct regarding the evening of the 8/4/13, together with documental evidence for his defence in the **APPENDICES**. The main issue is the Clerk's complaint of Cllr Robinson's alleged breach of the Council's Code of conduct regarding **Leadership, Appendix H** during about 10 minutes of questioning the Chair by Cllr Robinson causing disorder.

I repeat that, in my opinion, much of the blame for the disorder was due to the failings of the Chair, who has since been voted out of office. These failings are corroborated in witness statements on Page 7. For some inexplicable reason, the Clerk chose to blame me with allegations of harassment and bullying and sent a formal complaint to the Monitoring Office on the 9/4/13, copying to all Councillors, but excluding myself. An inspection of the Councillors' complaints, that defend both the Clerk and the Chair, reveals a barrage of hostile, uncorroborated complaints about my alleged behaviour in questioning the Clerk, when my questions were addressed to the Chair. There are also incredulous comments on unrelated issues and the Councillors appear to use this opportunity to vent their feelings and wishes to have me removed from office. This very disturbing unprecedented hounding continues to the present day from several Councillors and the Clerk, **See Page 11**. The main gist of my defence is the absence of any substantial factual evidence, apart from pointing and forgetting names. *I do not consider that these factual misdemeanours are a breach of Councillor Conduct and for the issues to be taken to a Public Hearing is beyond comprehension.* There is no evidence that I said anything or did anything that was seriously out of order. The complaints of allegedly banging my hand on the table, ranting on for an hour, frightening other Councillors and the other imaginary observations, are completely untrue and total nonsense. The allegations, some factual, made during the debate were based on a personal impression of what was seen and what was heard. On the one hand, seven complainants alleged I was harassing and bullying, whilst other attendees at the meeting gave a different view. The Minutes do not record evidence of harassment and bullying and I would suggest the comments by the Clerk referring to being harassed by me, was a perception in common with the other perceptions and opinions grouped on **Page 4**

Much has been made of the reason for my apology as being evidence of guilt, which I completely deny. Any distress felt by the Clerk, was caused by the sequence of events during the debate. John Davies comments...'**she (the Clerk) was left hanging out to dry ...by her biggest supporter, namely David Milton' (Chair) APPENDIX K**. Any apology by me was a token of showing concern for the Clerk and the disgraceful proceedings of the meeting. Please note that APPENDIX K is not from Sam Vernon but from John Davies. See 2.2.1. **Page 3.3**

The unfortunate demise of the previous Clerk, whose fraudulent actions, unnoticed by the Council, were unravelled by the present Clerk. This praiseworthy detection has for some reason, raised the profile of the Clerk in the eyes of Council, to a position well above her duties. Any unpopular questioning of Council matters is often answered by the Clerk as opposed to the Chair. In this capacity, most Councillors believe that the Clerk, as the Responsible Officer, is always correct. Councillors rarely question her actions and any challenging questions by residents or myself, are often met with unpleasantness from some Councillors and protection of the Clerk to the point of unbelief. This is undoubtedly what happened during my questioning on the 8/4/13 and sadly continues.

Any indication that the Clerk might resign due to a burden of overwork allegedly caused by responding to Freedom of Information FOI and Subject Access SA, requests, is awarded. This amounts to more protection of the Clerk, an increase in overtime decided by the Clerk, and silencing the questioner whether it is a parishioner or Councillor like myself. *I would suggest that Council should take a serious note of the excessive time and money wasted in fighting legal issues against parishioners and myself.* I say waste, as the Council has already lost two legal battles against two parishioners. However, the Clerk and 6 Councillors, against the advice of the Investigating Officer, often appear blinkered in their relentless determination to press the present complaints to a Public Hearing. On top of all this, the Clerk and the newly voted Chair carry on, regardless of time, money and effort, with their active attempts to continue to fight the issues the Council has already lost. This is regardless of the Council's priority of acting in the best interest of the electorate, **APPENDICES Y6 and Y7**. The 5 FOI requests were sent over 24 hours were repeat requests previously unanswered.

At the recent Council meeting on 1/9/14, the Council was overwhelmingly sympathetic to the alleged burden of work of the Clerk dealing with legal issues caused by the Council itself. As a result, a crucial residential issue of drainage affecting several homes with residential concerns raised over several years, was once again stalled. My offer to assist, by obtaining quotes for the drainage work, and hence reduce the alleged burden of work, were refused. I decided not to press the matter on behalf of residents attending, at the risk of being accused of further harassment and bullying.

In my opinion, the actions of the Council in closing ranks to support the Clerk and its unwillingness to listen to the views of parishioners and the views of Councillors that support the parishioners, is unhealthy. It demonstrates a corporate character of inflexibility and unwillingness to act in a manner that the electorate have requested and deserve. I have noticed these Council traits during my term in office and refer to the **Northill Parish Plan** submitted to the Council in 2008. Out of all the recommendations to the Council, by the parish residents and after several years work, very little has been achieved in the Parish, **APPENDICES Y8a/b**.

*I sincerely hope that my position and influence on the **Northill Parish Neighbourhood Planning Group** can help to reverse the trend and some positive action will be seen in the future.*

*I consider it is my duty as a Councillor to question issues, sometimes robustly, on behalf of the electorate, **to seek the truth**.* This is what I have done and will continue to do while I remain in office. *If the Clerk and certain Councillors consider my continuing actions to be inappropriate and give cause to formally complain, then that is a privilege of their position. However, I would maintain that accurate objective comments, listening and representing the views of the electorate and a willingness to reconsider previous decisions, in the light of fresh information, should be an overriding factor when considering Councillor Conduct.* Although there are 6 Councillor Complaints, the Council actions against me over the last 18 months have been somewhat Draconian, e.g. **APPENDICES Y13a/b**. *It has not created a healthy environment for a supposedly democratic and representative authority. The Parish deserves better than a corporate body that is inflexible and opposes or ignores so many things that its residents have requested. Northill Parish Council needs to have a good look at itself, otherwise it will be the cause and victim of its own disreputable actions.*

Cllr Ian Robinson 8th September 2014

Y APPENDICES as separate pages

**Y1 Email from Geoff Evans GUHG re matters not for the public domain Y2
Statement from owner re willingness to sell Ickwell Road site**

Y3 Support witness letter from Jill Parker re 8/4/13

Y4 Support witness letter from Jean Cordy re 8/4/13

Y5 Support witness letter from [REDACTED] re 8/4/13

Y6 Clerk's Email to Alistair Burt MP re FOI and SA requests

Y7 Cllr Papworth's Email to Alistair Burt MP re FOI and SA requests

Y8a/b

Comments on Parish Plan 2008 confirming Council had achieved little

Y9 Minutes of the Planning meeting on 25/3/13

Y10 Email from the Clerk refusing FOI request

Y11 Email from Cllr Papworth refusing FOI request

Y12 Email from the Clerk suggesting Cllr Robinson has memory problems

Y13a/b

Resolution from Cllr Bennett requesting non communication with Clerk

Y14 Witness statement regarding inaccurate financial figures and abuse

Cllr Robinson's responses to complaints unrelated to 8/4/13

Cllr Papworth 3.1.1 1 - At the Planning meeting on the 25/3/13. I was in the public gallery hence references to monopolising and voting are invalid, **APPENDIX Y9**.

Cllr Mandley 3.1.3.5 - I supported the views of the two parishioners in winning their two appeals against the Council. The Council alleged that the parishioners had caused the resignation of the previous Clerk, yet the resignation letter does not name the two parishioners as being the cause. The parishioners continue to be silenced despite winning the appeals. In a separate complaint*. Cllr Mandley makes some very serious allegations against me [REDACTED] and this is the subject of a separate ongoing enquiry by the Monitoring Office, the details of which, I have been asked not to divulge. Cllr Mandley has also questioned my integrity privately and publicly in relation to the same 2 parishioners. * I have recently learned that this complaint was withdrawn on 13/8/14.

CllrKay 5.1.4 – The articles are the comments of Caldecote Voices which are submitted by me to the Biggleswade Chronicle. Any grounds for misconduct here are nullified by the comments of the Investigating Officer in **5.1.5**

Cllr Momen 5.2.1 – 5.2.4 – I have never **accused the Clerk** of withholding information despite the fact that both the Clerk and Cllr Papworth, as acting Chair have refused certain FO1 requests, **APPENDICES Y10 and Y11**. The references to goading and sarcasm are completely unfounded.

Since the Clerk recommended that Matters Arising be removed from Council agenda items, the Annual Parish Meeting on the 31/3/14, provided an opportunity to ask some previously unanswered questions from the public gallery. The questions were copied to the Clerk the following day, **APPENDIX P, Page 2**. The response from the Clerk was that I have memory problems, **APPENDIX Y12**. This reply from the Clerk is with the Monitoring Office and is part of a separate complaint.

The Clerk does not acknowledge my greeting at meetings and since the 8/4/13 her correspondence to me is very formal. I am now requested not to communicate with Clerk until June 2015, as resolved by an Employment Grievance Panel of Cllrs Bennett, Kay & Mandley, (the Clerk being Cllr Papworth on 13/5/14. I declined to attend the hearing, as I was given one working days notice, disallowed representation and refused requested documents to prepare a defence. **APPENDIX Y13**.

Cllr Momen APPENDIX P. I was in the public gallery at the the APM on the 31/3/14 and witness statements confirm that the Clerk was unable to provide accurate figures to questions on finance. I also received repeated abusive comments from a Councillor. **APPENDIX Y14**. I consider comments about improving my conduct are inappropriate as I refute that I have ever breached any Councillor Code of Conduct during my term of office.

Cllr Papworth APPENDIX B, questions my honesty over pecuniary interests of which I have none. In addition, Cllr Papworth apologised for wrongly suggesting that I had passed a confidential letter to two parishioners

Cllr Ian Robinson 8th September 2014