29 October 2010

STANDARDS COMMITTEE HEARING – 8 NOVEMBER 2010

A Standards Committee Hearing will be held at 10.00am on Monday 8 November 2010 in Committee Room 1 at the Town Hall, Rugby.

Andrew Gabbitas
Executive Director

AGENDA

1. Apologies.

   To receive apologies for absence from the meeting.

2. Declarations of Interest.

   To receive declarations of –

   (a) personal interests as defined by the Council’s Code of Conduct for Councillors;

   (b) prejudicial interests as defined by the Council’s Code of Conduct for Councillors; and

   (c) notice under Section 106 Local Government Finance Act 1992 – non-payment of Community Charge or Council Tax.

Note: Members are reminded that they should declare the existence and nature of their personal interests at the commencement of the meeting (or as soon as the interest becomes apparent). If that interest is a prejudicial interest the Member must withdraw from the room unless one of the exceptions applies.

Membership of Warwickshire County Council or any Parish Council is classed as a personal interest under the Code of Conduct. A Member does not need to declare this interest unless the Member chooses to speak on a matter relating to their membership. If the Member does not wish to speak on the matter, the Member may still vote on the matter without making a declaration.
3. Case Numbers of Principal Authority: CC08/004 – CC09/007

To determine these cases.

Lunch for Members of the Committee will be served in the Members’ Room at 12.30pm

Membership of the Panel: -

Mr A Stothard (Chairman), Mrs C Truelove (Vice Chairman)
Borough Councillors Coles, Mrs Hotten, Mistry, Mrs Roodhouse and Helen Walton
Parish Councillor: Vaughan Owen
Independent Member: Mrs H Thornton
29 October 2010

Dear Committee Member

Standards Committee Hearing: 8th November 2010  
Case References CC08/004 – CC09/007

I am writing to confirm that a hearing will be held at 10.00am on Monday 8th November 2010 in Committee Room One at the Town Hall, Rugby to consider case numbers CC08/004 – CC09/007.

The allegations can be found on the attached pre-hearing summary sheet together with details of witnesses and the proposed procedure for the hearing.

Also attached to this letter are the following documents:

1. Copy of the agenda for the meeting
2. Copy of the Investigators report with accompanying background papers
3. Copy of the Code of Conduct for Parish Councils
4. Copy of the Local Determination Hearing Procedures

Councillor Mrs Wyatt has not indicated that she wants the hearing to be held in private and has not indicated that there are any documents she would wish to be withheld from the public.

I would be grateful if you could arrange to be outside the Committee Room at least ten minutes before the hearing is due to start.

If you have any questions about the hearing please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely

Mark Neale  
Legal Services and Elections Manager

Encs
Pre-Hearing Summary - 23 September 2010

Code of Conduct Complaint against Councillor Pat Wyatt

Name of Authority: Rugby Borough Council
Name of Subject Member: Councillor Pat Wyatt
Name of Complainant: Ms D Groves, Clerk to Long Lawford Parish Council
Case Numbers of Principal Authority: CCO8/004 – CCO9/007
Chair of the Hearing: Mr Alan Stothard
Monitoring Officer: Mark Neale
Clerk to Hearing: Elizabeth Routledge
Independent Investigator: Mr Kevin Douglas
Pre-Hearing Meeting: Held with Councillor Wyatt on 22 September 2010
Summary Produced: 23 September 2010
Date, time and Place of Hearing: 10.00am on 8th November 2010 at Rugby Borough Council

Summary of the Complaint:
That, Councillor Wyatt in respect of Complaints received from the Clerk of Long Lawford Parish Council failed to treat the Clerk with respect in breach of Paragraph 3(1) of the Code of Conduct for Members. That Councillor Wyatt bullied the Clerk in breach of Paragraph 3(2)(b) of the Code and disclosed information relating to a part of the Clerk’s terms and conditions of employment in breach of Paragraph 4 (a) of the Code of Conduct.

Findings of fact agreed in the Investigation Report:
Councillor Wyatt agreed with the findings of the report but disagreed with the evidence relied upon by the Investigator. It was agreed during the pre-hearing process meeting that Councillor Wyatt would need to produce evidence to support her assertions that the evidence given to the Investigator was incorrect.

Will the subject member, Monitoring officer or Investigator be represented at the hearing:
The current position is that Councillor Wyatt is proposing to represent herself at the hearing as will the Investigator and Monitoring Officer.
Names of Witnesses to be called at the hearing:

It is currently proposed that Councillor Wyatt will bring Mr Roper and Mrs Pallikaropoulos.

Outline of proposed procedure

The hearing

A standards committee hearing is a formal meeting of the authority and is not a court of law. It does not hear evidence under oath, but it does decide factual evidence on the balance of probabilities.

The standards committee should work at all times in a demonstrably fair, independent and politically impartial way. This helps to ensure that members of the public, and members of the authority, have confidence in its procedures and findings.

All concerned should treat the hearing process with respect and with regard to the potential seriousness of the outcome, for the subject member, the council and the public. For the subject member, an adverse decision by the committee can result in censure or in suspension for up to six months.

Evidence

The standards committee Chair controls the procedure and evidence presented at a hearing, including the number of witnesses and the way witnesses are questioned.

In many cases, the standards committee may not need to consider any evidence other than the investigation report or the ethical standards officer’s report, and any other supporting documents. However, the standards committee may need to hear from witnesses if more evidence is needed, or if people do not agree with certain findings of fact in the report.

The standards committee can allow witnesses to be questioned and cross-examined by the subject member, the monitoring officer or their representative. Alternatively, the standards committee can ask that these questions be directed through the chair. The standards committee can also question witnesses directly.

Witnesses

Generally, the subject member is entitled to present their case as they see fit, which includes calling the witnesses they may want and which are relevant to the matters to be heard. The subject member must make their own
arrangements to ensure that their witnesses (and witnesses they would like to question) will attend the hearing.

The standards committee has the right to govern its own procedures as long as it acts fairly. For this reason, the standards committee may limit the number of witnesses if the number is unreasonable.

The standards committee will normally take a decision on whether to hear any particular evidence or witness only after having heard submissions from both parties on the issue.

Witnesses of facts that are disputed would normally attend the hearing and should be prepared to be cross-examined. Witnesses as to the character of the subject member, if required, regularly present their evidence in writing and may or may not actually attend the hearing.

Witnesses, especially members of the public, often play an important part in the process and should be treated courtesy and respect. Authorities may wish to consider developing a witness care scheme. At the very least, witnesses should be kept promptly informed of the relevant dates, times and location of the hearing.

Standards committees should recognise that subject members also need to be kept fully appraised of the process and any changes to it. Some authorities appoint an officer as a point of contact with the subject member for the duration of the process.
Introduction and interpretation

1.—(1) This Code applies to you as a member of an authority.

(2) You should read this Code together with the general principles prescribed by the Secretary of State (see Annexure to this Code).

(3) It is your responsibility to comply with the provisions of this Code.

(4) In this Code—

“meeting” means any meeting of—

(a) the authority;

(b) any of the authority’s committees or sub-committees, joint committees or joint sub-committees;

“member” includes a co-opted member and an appointed member.

(5) References to an authority’s monitoring officer and an authority’s standards committee shall be read, respectively, as references to the monitoring officer and the standards committee of the district council or unitary county council which has functions in relation to the parish council for which it is responsible under section 55(12) of the Local Government Act 2000.

Scope

2.—(1) Subject to sub-paragraphs (2) to (5), you must comply with this Code whenever you—

(a) conduct the business of your authority (which, in this Code, includes the business of the office to which you are elected or appointed); or

(b) act, claim to act or give the impression you are acting as a representative of your authority,

and references to your official capacity are construed accordingly.

(2) Subject to sub-paragraphs (3) and (4), this Code does not have effect in relation to your conduct other than where it is in your official capacity.

(3) In addition to having effect in relation to conduct in your official capacity, paragraphs 3(2)(c), 5 and 6(a) also have effect, at any other time, where that conduct constitutes a criminal offence for which you have been convicted.

(4) Conduct to which this Code applies (whether that is conduct in your official capacity or conduct mentioned in sub-paragraph (3)) includes a criminal offence for which you are convicted (including an offence you committed before the date you took office, but for which you are convicted after that date).

(5) Where you act as a representative of your authority—

(a) on another relevant authority, you must, when acting for that other authority, comply with that other authority’s code of conduct; or

(b) on any other body, you must, when acting for that other body, comply with your authority’s code of conduct, except and insofar as it conflicts with any other lawful obligations to which that other body may be subject.
General obligations

3.—(1) You must treat others with respect.
   (2) You must not—
   (a) do anything which may cause your authority to breach any of the equality
       enactments (as defined in section 33 of the Equality Act 2006(a));
   (b) bully any person;
   (c) intimidate or attempt to intimidate any person who is or is likely to be—
       (i) a complainant,
       (ii) a witness, or
       (iii) involved in the administration of any investigation or proceedings,
           in relation to an allegation that a member (including yourself) has failed to comply
           with his or her authority’s code of conduct; or
   (d) do anything which compromises or is likely to compromise the impartiality of
       those who work for, or on behalf of, your authority.

4. You must not—
   (a) disclose information given to you in confidence by anyone, or information
       acquired by you which you believe, or ought reasonably to be aware, is of a
       confidential nature, except where—
       (i) you have the consent of a person authorised to give it;
       (ii) you are required by law to do so;
       (iii) the disclosure is made to a third party for the purpose of obtaining
           professional advice provided that the third party agrees not to disclose the
           information to any other person; or
       (iv) the disclosure is—
           (aa) reasonable and in the public interest; and
           (bb) made in good faith and in compliance with the reasonable
                requirements of the authority; or
   (b) prevent another person from gaining access to information to which that person is
       entitled by law.

5. You must not conduct yourself in a manner which could reasonably be regarded as
   bringing your office or authority into disrepute.

6. You—
   (a) must not use or attempt to use your position as a member improperly to confer on
       or secure for yourself or any other person, an advantage or disadvantage; and
   (b) must, when using or authorising the use by others of the resources of your
       authority—
       (i) act in accordance with your authority’s reasonable requirements; and
       (ii) ensure that such resources are not used improperly for political purposes
           (including party political purposes).
   (c) must have regard to any applicable Local Authority Code of Publicity made under
       the Local Government Act 1986.

7. Paragraph 7 does not apply to your authority.

(a) 2006 c.3.
Personal interests

8.—(1) You have a personal interest in any business of your authority where either—
   (a) it relates to or is likely to affect—
       (i) any body of which you are a member or in a position of general control or management and to which you are appointed or nominated by your authority;
       (ii) any body—
           (aa) exercising functions of a public nature;
           (bb) directed to charitable purposes; or
           (cc) one of whose principal purposes includes the influence of public opinion or policy (including any political party or trade union),
           of which you are a member or in a position of general control or management;
       (iii) any employment or business carried on by you;
       (iv) any person or body who employs or has appointed you;
       (v) any person or body, other than a relevant authority, who has made a payment to you in respect of your election or any expenses incurred by you in carrying out your duties;
       (vi) any person or body who has a place of business or land in your authority’s area, and in whom you have a beneficial interest in a class of securities of that person or body that exceeds the nominal value of £25,000 or one hundredth of the total issued share capital (whichever is the lower);
       (vii) any contract for goods, services or works made between your authority and you or a firm in which you are a partner, a company of which you are a remunerated director, or a person or body of the description specified in paragraph (vi);
       (viii) the interests of any person from whom you have received a gift or hospitality with an estimated value of at least £25;
       (ix) any land in your authority’s area in which you have a beneficial interest;
       (x) any land where the landlord is your authority and you are, or a firm in which you are a partner, a company of which you are a remunerated director, or a person or body of the description specified in paragraph (vi) is, the tenant;
       (xi) any land in the authority’s area for which you have a licence (alone or jointly with others) to occupy for 28 days or longer; 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—
       (i) (in the case of authorities with electoral divisions or wards) other council taxpayers, ratepayers or inhabitants of the electoral division or ward, as the case may be, affected by the decision; or
       (ii) (in all other cases) other council taxpayers, ratepayers or inhabitants of your authority’s area.

(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
   (b) any person or body who employs or has appointed such persons, any firm in which they are a partner, or any company of which they are directors;
(c) any person or body in whom such persons have a beneficial interest in a class of securities exceeding the nominal value of £25,000; or
(d) any body of a type described in sub-paragraph (1)(a)(i) or (ii).

Disclosure of personal interests

9.—(1) Subject to sub-paragraphs (2) to (5), where you have a personal interest in any business of your authority and you attend a meeting of your 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.

(2) Where you have a personal interest in any business of your authority which relates to or is likely to affect a person described in paragraph 8(1)(a)(i) or 8(1)(a)(ii)(aa), you need only disclose to the meeting the existence and nature of that interest when you address the meeting on that business.

(3) Where you have a personal interest in any business of the authority of the type mentioned in paragraph 8(1)(a)(viii), you need not disclose the nature or existence of that interest to the meeting if the interest was registered more than three years before the date of the meeting.

(4) Sub-paragraph (1) only applies where you are aware or ought reasonably to be aware of the existence of the personal interest.

(5) Where you have a personal interest but, by virtue of paragraph 14, sensitive information relating to it is not registered in your authority's register of members' interests, you must indicate to the meeting that you have a personal interest, but need not disclose the sensitive information to the meeting.

Prejudicial interest generally

10.—(1) Subject to sub-paragraph (2), where you have a personal interest in any business of your 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.

(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

(c) relates to the functions of your authority in respect of—

(i) this sub-paragraph does not apply to your authority;

(ii) this sub-paragraph does not apply to your authority;

(iii) statutory sick pay under Part XI of the Social Security Contributions and Benefits Act 1992, where you are in receipt of, or are entitled to the receipt of, such pay;

(iv) an allowance, payment or indemnity given to members;

(v) any ceremonial honour given to members; and

(vi) setting council tax or a precept under the Local Government Finance Act 1992.

11. Paragraph 11 does not apply to your authority.
Effect of prejudicial interests on participation

12.— (1) Subject to sub-paragraph (2), where you have a prejudicial interest in any business of your authority—
   (a) you must withdraw from the room or chamber where a meeting considering the business is being held—
      (i) in a case where sub-paragraph (2) applies, immediately after making representations, answering questions or giving evidence;
      (ii) in any other case, whenever it becomes apparent that the business is being considered at that meeting;
      unless you have obtained a dispensation from your authority’s standards committee; and
   (b) you must not seek improperly to influence a decision about that business.

(2) Where you have a prejudicial interest in any business of your authority, you may attend a meeting but only for the purpose of making representations, answering questions or giving evidence relating to the business, provided that the public are also allowed to attend the meeting for the same purpose, whether under a statutory right or otherwise.

Part 3
Registration of Members’ Interests

Registration of members’ interests

13.— (1) Subject to paragraph 14, you must, within 28 days of—
   (a) this Code being adopted by or applied to your authority; or
   (b) your election or appointment to office (where that is later),
   register in your authority’s register of members’ interests (maintained under section 81(1) of the Local Government Act 2000) details of your personal interests where they fall within a category mentioned in paragraph 8(1)(a), by providing written notification to your authority’s monitoring officer.

(2) Subject to paragraph 14, you must, within 28 days of becoming aware of any new personal interest or change to any personal interest registered under paragraph (1), register details of that new personal interest or change by providing written notification to your authority’s monitoring officer.

Sensitive information

14.— (1) Where you consider that the information relating to any of your personal interests is sensitive information, and your authority’s monitoring officer agrees, you need not include that information when registering that interest, or, as the case may be, a change to that interest under paragraph 13.

(2) You must, within 28 days of becoming aware of any change of circumstances which means that information excluded under paragraph (1) is no longer sensitive information, notify your authority’s monitoring officer asking that the information be included in your authority’s register of members’ interests.

(3) In this Code, “sensitive information” means information whose availability for inspection by the public creates, or is likely to create, a serious risk that you or a person who lives with you may be subjected to violence or intimidation.
Annexure - The Ten General Principles

The general principles governing your conduct under the Relevant Authorities (General Principles) Order 2001 are set out below:

**Selflessness**

1. Members should serve only the public interest and should never improperly confer an advantage or disadvantage on any person.

**Honesty and Integrity**

2. Members should not place themselves in situations where their honesty and integrity may be questioned, should not behave improperly and should on all occasions avoid the appearance of such behaviour.

**Objectivity**

3. Members should make decisions on merit, including when making appointments, awarding contracts, or recommending individuals for rewards or benefits.

**Accountability**

4. Members should be accountable to the public for their actions and the manner in which they carry out their responsibilities, and should co-operate fully and honestly with any scrutiny appropriate to their particular office.

**Openness**

5. Members should be as open as possible about their actions and those of their authority, and should be prepared to give reasons for those actions.

**Personal Judgement**

6. Members may take account of the views of others, including their political groups, but should reach their own conclusions on the issues before them and act in accordance with those conclusions.

**Respect for Others**

7. Members should promote equality by not discriminating unlawfully against any person, and by treating people with respect, regardless of their race, age, religion, gender, sexual orientation or disability. They should respect the impartiality and integrity of the authority's statutory officers, and its other employees.

**Duty to Uphold the Law**

8. Members should uphold the law and, on all occasions, act in accordance with the trust that the public is entitled to place in them.

**Stewardship**

9. Members should do whatever they are able to do to ensure that their authorities use their resources prudently and in accordance with the law.

**Leadership**

10. Members should promote and support these principles by leadership, and by example, and should act in a way that secures or preserves public confidence.
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2 STANDARDS COMMITTEE DETERMINATIONS
This guidance is designed to help members and officers in relevant authorities who are involved in the determination of complaints that a member may have breached the Code of Conduct. It reflects the Standards Committee (England) Regulations 2008 (the regulations). These regulations are mandatory and this guidance must be taken into account by your authority.

It details each stage of the determination of complaints process and offers suggestions for effective practice. In addition, it provides a toolkit of useful document templates that may be used or adapted by authorities as required.

The guide is aimed primarily at members of standards committees and monitoring officers, but will also provide a useful reference tool for all members and officers involved in the determination of complaints.

It applies to:

- district, unitary, metropolitan, county and London borough councils
- English police authorities
- fire and rescue authorities (including fire and civil defence authorities)
- the London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority
- passenger transport authorities
- the Broads Authority
- national park authorities
- the Greater London Authority
- the Common Council of the City of London
- the Council of the Isles of Scilly

Each authority must develop effective procedures to fulfil its legislative requirements. Members and officers involved in the determination of complaints must take this guidance into account when doing so.

Any reference in this guidance to a standards committee includes a reference to sub-committees established to consider a monitoring officer's investigation report and to consider determination hearings. Any reference to the “subject member” is a reference to the member who is the subject of the complaint that the Code of Conduct may have been breached.
You can contact the Standards Board for England on 0845 078 8131 or email enquiries@standardsboard.gov.uk

Regulations

The Standards Board for England has issued this guidance to reflect the Standards Committee (England) Regulations 2008 (the regulations) in respect of holding determination hearings. These regulations derive from the Local Government Act 2000, as amended by the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007.

The regulations set out the framework for the operation of a locally based system for the assessment, referral, investigation and hearing of complaints of member misconduct. Under the regulations, standards committees must take this guidance into account.

The regulations do not cover joint working between authorities. The government plans to issue further regulations to provide a framework for authorities to work jointly on the assessment, referral, investigation and hearing of complaints of misconduct by their members.

Background

The main purpose of the standards committee's determination hearing is to decide whether a member has breached the Code of Conduct and, if so, to decide if a sanction should be applied and what form the sanction should take. All complaints that a member may have breached the Code are assessed by the relevant authority's standards committee.

The standards committee must establish a sub-committee (the assessment sub-committee) which is responsible for assessing complaints that a member may have breached the Code. A complainant may make a request for a review of the standards committee's decision where it decides to take no further action on a complaint. The standards committee must establish a review sub-committee which is responsible for carrying out these reviews.

The standards committee should appoint a sub-committee (the consideration and hearing sub-committee) to consider a monitoring officer's investigation report and to hold determination hearings. This sub-committee must be chaired by an independent member of the standards committee.

On completion of an investigation the monitoring officer must make one of the following findings:

- There has been a failure to comply with the Code.
- There has not been a failure to comply with the Code.

They must write an investigation report and send a copy of it to the subject member. Alternatively, where a Standards Board ethical standards officer has completed an investigation and decided that a complaint should be determined by the standards committee, they will refer their report to the monitoring officer.

The monitoring officer must refer the report to the standards committee. A consideration and hearing sub-committee
should be appointed to receive and consider such reports. If the investigator, in their report, finds no failure to comply with the Code of Conduct, the standards committee must decide whether to accept that recommendation. The standards committee must also decide whether it or the First-tier Tribunal should hear the case. This preliminary decision must be formally made and recorded.

A meeting of the standards committee to consider the monitoring officer's investigation report must be convened under Regulation 17 of the regulations. Regulation 8(6) allows the consideration of any information presented for that purpose to be considered as exempt information.

As with all exempt information decisions, the standards committee must decide whether the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information. When advising on this matter the monitoring officer should consider the effect of Regulation 17(4). This regulation allows the subject member to prohibit the publication of a notice, stating that the standards committee has found that there has been no failure to comply with the Code.

Despite the ability of the subject member to prohibit the publication of a notice, the decision as to whether to maintain an exemption does not always have to result in the public being excluded from a meeting. It also does not always have to result in excluding details of the complaint from the report sent out in advance of the meeting. In most cases, the public interest in transparent decision-making by the standards committee will outweigh the subject member's interest in limiting publication of an unproven allegation that has not yet been determined.

A member of the standards committee who considers and overturns a monitoring officer's finding that there has been no failure to comply with the Code may participate in a subsequent hearing.

This meeting to consider the monitoring officer's investigation report provides a useful opportunity for the standards committee to consider the potential issues which might arise during the pre-hearing process.

This consideration meeting is separate to the meeting at which the hearing is conducted. If the investigation report finds that there has been a failure to comply with the Code a hearing must take place – unless the standards committee decides that the matter should be referred to the First-tier Tribunal for determination.
Timing of the standards committee hearing

Under Regulation 18 of the regulations, a standards committee must hear a complaint within three months of the date on which the monitoring officer’s report was completed. If the investigation was carried out by an ethical standards officer, the standards committee must hear the complaint within three months of the date that the monitoring officer received the ethical standards officer’s report.

As with a meeting to consider a monitoring officer or ethical standards officer’s report, when the standards committee is convened for a hearing under Regulation 18 it is also subject to Regulation 8(6).

When assessing whether the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information, monitoring officers similarly need to consider the effect of Regulation 20(2). This allows the subject member to prohibit normal publication of the committee’s notice of the finding of no failure to comply with the Code of Conduct.

As before, despite the ability of the subject member to prohibit the publication of a notice, the decision as to whether to maintain an exemption does not always have to result in the public being excluded from a hearing. It also does not always have to result in excluding details of the complaint from the report sent out in advance of the hearing. In most cases, the public interest in transparent decision-making by the standards committee will outweigh the subject member’s interest in limiting publication of an unproven allegation that has not yet been determined.

In most cases all parties will agree that the hearing should take place in public. It is sensible to seek the views of the relevant parties as early as possible to allow for legal advice to be sought if required.

If the standards committee decides that a hearing is appropriate they should give a copy of the report to:

- the subject member
- the clerk of any relevant town or parish council
- the standards committees of any other authorities concerned

The hearing must take place at least 14 days after the subject member receives a copy of the report from the monitoring officer. However, the hearing can be held sooner than 14 days after the member receives a copy of the report if the subject member agrees.

The standards committee may consider the report in the subject member’s absence if the subject member does not go to the hearing. If the standards committee is satisfied with the subject member’s reasons for not being able to come to the hearing, it should arrange for the hearing to be held on another date.

If the standards committee does not hear the matter within three months of receiving the completed report, it must ensure that the matter is heard as soon as possible after that.
Scheduling a hearing

Except in the most complicated cases, standards committees should aim to complete a hearing in one sitting or in consecutive sittings of no more than one working day in total.

When scheduling hearings, standards committees should bear in mind that late-night and very lengthy hearings are not ideal for effective decision-making. Equally, having long gaps between sittings can lead to important matters being forgotten.

The pre-hearing process

The purpose of the pre-hearing process is to allow matters at the hearing to be dealt with more fairly and economically. This is because it quickly alerts parties to possible areas of difficulty and, if possible, allows them to be resolved before the hearing itself.

Other than in very straightforward cases, authorities should use a pre-hearing process to:

- identify whether the subject member disagrees with any of the findings of fact in the investigation report
- identify whether those disagreements are likely to be relevant to any matter the hearing needs to decide
- identify whether evidence about those disagreements will need to be heard during the hearing
- decide whether there are any parts of the hearing that are likely to be held in private
- decide whether any parts of the investigation report or other documents should be withheld from the public prior to the hearing, on the grounds that they contain 'exempt' material

The pre-hearing process should usually be carried out in writing. However, occasionally a meeting between the standards committee, the relevant parties and their representatives may be necessary. It is important for the monitoring officer advising the standards committee to consider pre-hearing matters carefully.

Some matters in the pre-hearing process may be decided only by the standards committee or consideration and hearing sub-committee (if one is appointed). Therefore, if it is necessary for the standards committee to meet, they will have to do so formally as with any other council committee meeting. However, it is usually more appropriate for the majority of the pre-hearing process to be dealt with by the monitoring officer or other suitable officer.

Key points for the pre-hearing process

The officer providing administrative support to the standards committee should write to the subject member proposing a date for the hearing, and they should do this in consultation with the chair of the standards committee.
They should also outline the hearing procedure, the member’s rights and they should additionally ask for a written response from the subject member within a set time. This is to find out whether the subject member:

- wants to be represented at the hearing by a solicitor, barrister or any other person
- disagrees with any of the findings of fact in the investigation report, including reasons for any of these disagreements
- wants to give evidence to the standards committee, either verbally or in writing
- wants to call relevant witnesses to give evidence to the standards committee
- wants any part of the hearing to be held in private
- wants any part of the investigation report or other relevant documents to be withheld from the public
- can attend the hearing

This is because attention to the factual issues will save valuable time later on in the determination process.

The standards committee should start this process by requesting that the subject member makes clear precisely what findings of fact in the report it disagrees with and why.

It should invite the monitoring officer or ethical standards officer to comment on the subject member’s response within a set time period. This is to ensure that all parties are clear about the remaining factual disputes and can prepare to deal with those issues on the appointed day.

The standards committee should also ask the relevant parties to provide outlines or statements of the evidence their witnesses intend to give. This will allow the standards committee to decide how many witnesses may reasonably be needed and to identify the issues they will be dealing with at the hearing.

It should only allow the relevant parties to raise new disagreements over factual matters in the investigation report at the hearing in exceptional circumstances, such as new evidence becoming available that the parties could not have produced before. The standards committee should make clear to the subject member that unless they comply with the above procedure, it may rule that it will not allow the new evidence to be presented at the hearing.
Members of the standards committee should consider the evidence provided to them before the hearing to identify any potential conflicts of interest.

In addition, they should consider the evidence to identify any connection with the people involved or any other doubts they have over the integrity of the hearing. If they have such concerns, they should seek advice from the monitoring officer as soon as possible. For example, they may know a witness who will be giving controversial evidence or they may have an interest in an important element of the case.

The determinations toolkit features model forms that can help the member respond to the standards committee. It includes a form to identify any findings of fact that the member disagrees with — Form A. It also includes a form to outline any further evidence for the standards committee — Form B.

The standards committee may also arrange for any other witnesses to be present who they feel may help in determining the case. This may include the complainant. However, the standards committee cannot order witnesses to appear or give evidence.

Pre-hearing process summary

The standards committee’s clerk should consult with the committee’s legal adviser and send a pre-hearing process summary to everyone involved in the complaint at least two weeks before the hearing. This should be done after the standards committee has received responses from the subject member and from the investigating officer. The pre-hearing process summary should:

- set the date, time and place for the hearing
- summarise the allegation
- outline the main facts of the case that are agreed
- outline the main facts which are not agreed
- note whether the subject member or investigating officer will go to the hearing or be represented at the hearing
- list those witnesses, if any, who will be asked to give evidence, subject to the power of the standards committee to make a ruling on this at the hearing
- outline the proposed procedure for the hearing

You can find a checklist for this pre-hearing process summary document in the toolkit — Form F.
The hearing

Members should bear in mind that a standards committee hearing is a formal meeting of the authority and is not a court of law. It does not hear evidence under oath, but it does decide factual evidence on the balance of probabilities. The standards committee should work at all times in a demonstrably fair, independent and politically impartial way. This helps to ensure that members of the public, and members of the authority, have confidence in its procedures and findings.

The standards committee should bear in mind the need to maintain public confidence in the council’s ethical standards. This requires that the standards committee’s decisions should be seen as open, unprejudiced and unbiased. All concerned should treat the hearing process with respect and with regard to the potential seriousness of the outcome, for the subject member, the council and the public. For the subject member, an adverse decision by the committee can result in censure or in suspension for up to six months.

Representatives

The subject member may choose to be represented by counsel, a solicitor, or by any other person they wish. If the subject member concerned wants to have a non-legal representative, the subject member must obtain the consent of the standards committee.

The standards committee may choose to

withdraw its permission to allow a representative if that representative disrupts the hearing. However, an appropriate warning will usually be enough to prevent more disruptions and should normally be given before permission is withdrawn.

Evidence

The standards committee controls the procedure and evidence presented at a hearing, including the number of witnesses and the way witnesses are questioned.

In many cases, the standards committee may not need to consider any evidence other than the investigation report or the ethical standards officer’s report, and any other supporting documents. However, the standards committee may need to hear from witnesses if more evidence is needed, or if people do not agree with certain findings of fact in the report.

The standards committee can allow witnesses to be questioned and cross-examined by the subject member, the monitoring officer, the ethical standards officer or their representative. Alternatively, the standards committee can ask that these questions be directed through the chair. The standards committee can also question witnesses directly.
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Witnesses

Generally, the subject member is entitled to present their case as they see fit, which includes calling the witnesses they may want and which are relevant to the matters to be heard. The subject member must make their own arrangements to ensure that their witnesses (and witnesses they would like to question) will attend the hearing.

The standards committee has the right to govern its own procedures as long as it acts fairly. For this reason, the standards committee may limit the number of witnesses if the number is unreasonable.

The standards committee will normally take a decision on whether to hear any particular evidence or witness only after having heard submissions from both parties on the issue.

Witnesses of facts that are disputed would normally attend the hearing and should be prepared to be cross-examined. Witnesses as to the character of the subject member, if required, regularly present their evidence in writing and may or may not actually attend the hearing.

Witnesses, especially members of the public, often play an important part in the process and should be treated with courtesy and respect. Authorities may wish to consider developing a witness care scheme. At the very least, witnesses should be kept promptly informed of the relevant dates, times and location of the hearing.

Standards committees should recognise that subject members also need to be kept fully apprised of the process and any changes to it. Some authorities appoint an officer as a point of contact with the subject member for the duration of the process.

Sanctions

If the standards committee finds that a subject member has failed to follow the Code of Conduct and that they should be sanctioned, it may impose any one or a combination of the following:

- censure of that member

- restriction for a period not exceeding six months (three months for complaints received by the Standards Board before 8 May 2008) of that member's access to the premises of the authority or that member's use of the resources of the authority, provided that those restrictions meet both the following requirements:
  i) They are reasonable and proportionate to the nature of the breach.
  ii) They do not unduly restrict the person's ability to perform the functions of a member.

- partial suspension of that member for a period not exceeding six months (three months for complaints received by the Standards Board before 8 May 2008)

- suspension of that member for a period not exceeding six months (three months for complaints received by the Standards Board before 8 May 2008)
that the member submits a written apology in a form specified by the standards committee

that the member undertakes such training as the standards committee specifies

that the member participates in such conciliation as the standards committee specifies

partial suspension of that member for a period not exceeding six months (three months for complaints received by the Standards Board before 8 May 2008) or until such time as the member has met either of the following restrictions:
  i) They have submitted a written apology in a form specified by the standards committee.
  ii) They have undertaken such training or has participated in such conciliation as the standards committee specifies.

suspension of that member for a period not exceeding six months (three months for complaints received by the Standards Board before 8 May 2008) or until such time as the member has met either of the following restrictions:
  i) They have submitted a written apology in a form specified by the standards committee.
  ii) They have undertaken such training or has participated in such conciliation as the standards committee specifies.

Suspension or partial suspension will normally start immediately after the standards committee has made its decision. However, if the standards committee chooses, the sanction may start at any time up to six months following its decision. This may be appropriate if the sanction would otherwise have little effect on the subject member. For example, in the case of a suspension or partial suspension where there are no authority or committee meetings which the subject member would normally go to in the period after the hearing has finished. The standards committee should also confirm the consequences, if any, for any allowances the subject member may be receiving.

Periods of suspension or partial suspension set by a standards committee do not count towards the six-month limit for absences from authority meetings, after which a member would normally be removed from office under section 85 of the Local Government Act 1972.

Considering the sanction

When deciding on a sanction, the standards committee should ensure that it is reasonable and proportionate to the subject member’s behaviour. Before deciding what sanction to issue, the standards committee should consider the following questions, along with any other relevant circumstances:

What was the subject member’s intention? Did the subject member know that they were failing to follow the Code of Conduct?
Did the subject member get advice from officers before the incident? Was that advice acted on or ignored in good faith?

Has there been a breach of trust?

Has there been financial impropriety, for example improper expense claims or procedural irregularities?

What was the result of failing to follow the Code of Conduct?

What were the potential results of the failure to follow the Code of Conduct?

How serious was the incident?

Does the subject member accept they were at fault?

Did the subject member apologise to the relevant people?

Has the subject member previously been warned or reprimanded for similar misconduct?

Has the subject member failed to follow the Code of Conduct before?

Is the subject member likely to do the same thing again?

How will the sanction be carried out? For example, who will provide the training or mediation?

Are there any resource or funding implications? For example, if a subject member has repeatedly or blatantly misused the authority’s information technology resources, the standards committee may consider withdrawing those resources from the subject member.

Suspension may be appropriate for more serious cases, such as those involving:

- trying to gain an advantage or disadvantage for themselves or others
- dishonesty or breaches of trust
- bullying

Sanctions involving restricting access to an authority’s premises or equipment should not unnecessarily restrict the subject member’s ability to carry out their responsibilities as an elected representative or co-opted member.

The following is an extract from useful guidance published by the First-tier Tribunal on aggravating and mitigating factors they take into account when assessing an appropriate sanction:

"Examples, but not an exhaustive list, of mitigating factors are:

- An honestly held, although mistaken, view that the action concerned did not constitute a failure to follow the provisions of the Code of Conduct, particularly where such a view has been formed after taking appropriate advice."
A member’s previous record of good service.

Substantiated evidence that the member’s actions have been affected by ill-health.

Recognition that there has been a failure to follow the Code; co-operation in rectifying the effects of that failure; an apology to affected persons where that is appropriate, self-reporting of the breach by the member.

Compliance with the Code since the events giving rise to the determination.

Some actions, which may have involved a breach of the Code, may nevertheless have had a beneficial effect for the public.

Examples, but again not an exhaustive list, of aggravating factors are:

- Dishonesty.
- Continuing to deny the facts despite clear contrary evidence.
- Seeking unfairly to blame other people.
- Failing to heed appropriate advice or warnings or previous findings of a failure to follow the provisions of the Code.
- Persisting with a pattern of behaviour which involves repeatedly failing to abide by the provisions of the Code.

The First-tier Tribunal also advises the following:

In deciding what action to take, the Case Tribunal should bear in mind an aim of upholding and improving the standard of conduct expected of members of the various bodies to which the Codes of Conduct apply, as part of the process of fostering public confidence in local democracy. Thus, the action taken by the Case Tribunal should be designed both to discourage or prevent the particular Respondent from any future non-compliance and also to discourage similar action by others.

Case Tribunals should take account of the actual consequences which have followed as a result of the member’s actions while at the same time bearing in mind what the possible consequences may have been even if they did not come about.

This guidance does not include a firm tariff from which to calculate what length of disqualification or suspension should be applied to particular breaches of the Code. Any such tariff should in any event need to have regard to the need to make adjustments toward the lower end of the spectrum if there are mitigating factors and towards the upper end if there are aggravating factors.
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findings

Notice of the standards committee's findings

The standards committee should announce its decision at the end of the hearing. It is good practice to make a short written decision available on the day of the hearing, and to prepare the full written decision in draft on that day, before people's memories fade. The officer providing administrative support to the standards committee will normally also draft minutes of the meeting.

The standards committee must give its full written decision to the relevant parties as soon as possible after the hearing. In most cases this should be within two weeks of the hearing.

The relevant parties are:

- the subject member
- the complainant
- the standards committees of any other authorities concerned
- any parish or town councils concerned
- the Standards Board for England

Making the findings public

The standards committee must arrange for a summary of the decision and reasons for it to be published in at least one newspaper that is independent of the authorities concerned. The newspapers where the decision and reasons are published should be circulated in the area of the authorities involved. A summary of the decision may also be published on the website of any authorities concerned, and in any other publication if the standards committee considers it appropriate.

If the standards committee finds that the subject member did not fail to follow the authority's Code of Conduct, the public summary must say this and give reasons for this finding. In such cases, the subject member is also entitled to decide that no summary of the decision should be passed to local newspapers.

If the standards committee finds that the subject member failed to follow the Code but that no action is needed, the public summary must:

- say that the member failed to follow the Code, but that no action needs to be taken
- outline what happened
- give reasons for the standards committee's decision not to take any action
- state that the member may appeal against that finding

If the standards committee finds that a member failed to follow the Code and it imposed a sanction, the public summary must:

- say that the member failed to follow the Code
- outline what happened
findings

- explain what sanction has been imposed
- give reasons for the decision made by the standards committee
- state that the member may appeal against that finding

The standards committee’s reports and minutes should be available for public inspection for six years after the hearing. However, sections of documents relating to parts of the hearing that were held in private will not have to be made available for public inspection.

Written decision format

For consistency and thoroughness, standards committees should use the following format for their full written decisions.

The front cover of the standards committee’s full written decision should include the name of the:

- authority
- subject member
- complainant
- standards committee member who chaired the hearing
- standards committee members who took part in the hearing
- monitoring officer
- ethical standards officer who referred the matter (if applicable)
- local investigator who investigated the matter (if applicable)
- clerk of the hearing or other administrative officer

It should also include:

- case reference numbers from the principal authority and from the Standards Board for England, (if applicable)
- the date of the hearing
- the date of the report

The standards committee’s full written decision should include:

- a summary of the complaint
- the relevant section or sections of the Code of Conduct
- a summary of the evidence considered and representations made
- the findings of fact, including the reasons for them
- the finding as to whether the member failed to follow the Code, including the reasons for that finding
- the sanctions imposed, if any, including the reasons for any sanctions
- the right to appeal.
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The Local Government Act 2000 enables the First-tier Tribunal and standards committees to suspend and partially suspend members found to be in breach of the Code of Conduct. But, it does not specify exactly what members can and cannot do in their official capacity during the term of suspension.

This has led to confusion in some authorities as to what representative roles, if any, a suspended member can perform. It has also led to confusion over what council facilities they are allowed to use and what entitlements they can continue to receive as a suspended member. This section clarifies what representative roles, if any, a suspended member can perform.

Full suspensions

Members under full suspension should not:

1) Take part in any formal business of the authority

A member who is fully suspended may not exercise any of the functions or responsibilities of membership of the authority. Section 83(9) of the Local Government Act 2000 further provides that a suspended member should not participate in any committee or sub-committee of the authority.

2) Have access to council facilities

Suspended members should not use or have access to council facilities. As the member is under suspension and unable to conduct council business, it follows that any use of council facilities by a suspended member would not be conducive to the discharge of the functions of the authority. This is because the member would not be performing council business while suspended.

3) Receive their council allowance

Under Regulation 4(3) of the Local Authorities (Members Allowances) Regulations 2003, councils may specify in their member allowance schemes that:

"Where a member is suspended or partially suspended from his responsibilities or duties as a member of an authority in accordance with part III of the Local Government Act 2000 or regulations made under that Part, the part of basic allowance payable to him in respect of the period for which he is suspended or partially suspended may be withheld by the authority."

It is recommended that members should not receive their allowance while under suspension because they are not performing their role as a member. But, the decision to withhold a member's allowance is ultimately at the discretion of the individual authority.
Members under suspension, should:

1) **Make their suspended status clear**

While suspended members remain councillors, they should put 'suspended' after their name when referring to themselves in writing as members. They should also notify constituents of this when contacted by them on constituency business. This is to ensure that all concerned are aware that the member is under suspension and unable to perform council duties.

2) **Make arrangements for another member to handle their constituency work**

With help from their council officers, suspended members can arrange for other ward members to handle their constituency work. Or, in the case of a single-member ward, suspended members can arrange for neighbouring ward members to take over their constituency work for the duration of the suspension. This ensures that constituents continue to be democratically represented.

What responsibilities remain for suspended members?

The Code of Conduct does not apply to a person who has been suspended in respect of a relevant function of office for a relevant period of time, so long as the member makes it clear that they have been suspended and does not purport to act as a representative of their authority.

However, when amendments to section 52 of the Local Government Act 2000 come into effect, three paragraphs under the Code of Conduct will apply, "at any other time, where that conduct constitutes a criminal offence". As such, these paragraphs will still apply to members who are suspended. These paragraphs will be:

- paragraph 3(2)(c) – intimidation of certain persons in relation to an allegation under the Code of Conduct
- paragraph 5 – disrepute
- paragraph 6(a) – improperly conferring or securing an advantage or disadvantage

**Partial suspensions**

Members can be partially suspended under sections 83(9) and (10) of the Local Government Act 2000. While members who are fully suspended cannot take part in any formal business of the authority during the period of suspension, members who are partially suspended are restricted only from certain activities or business.

The terms of a partial suspension must be set by the standards committee during sentencing. It will often involve suspension from certain committees, or restricted access to certain areas or individuals.

A partial suspension enables the committee to tailor a sanction to the particular breach, while still allowing the member to carry out other functions. For instance, a member who failed to uphold
suspensions

the Code of Conduct at a planning committee could be suspended from taking part in planning committee meetings for a certain period. Or a member who bullied licensing officers about an application might be barred from contact with officers of the licensing department for a certain period. Again we recommend that members should not receive allowances relating to areas in which they are suspended from for the duration of their suspension.

Officers and members of the authority should be informed of a member's suspension and advised of the suspended member's rights and obligations, as detailed earlier. The council should also help the member make arrangements for another member, either from their ward or a neighbouring ward, to take over constituency work.

It may also notify the public in the authority's area that the member is suspended and unable to perform official council duties until the end of the suspension. Once the suspension has ended, the member is free to resume their duties in full as a member of the authority.
**appeals**

**Appeal to the First-tier Tribunal**

Where a standards committee decides that a member has failed to comply with the Code of Conduct, the member may within 28 days of being notified of that decision, seek permission to appeal to the First Tier Tribunal and if appropriate, apply to the First-tier Tribunal for the suspension of any sanction imposed until such time as any appeal is determined.

In deciding whether to give permission to appeal, the First-tier Tribunal will consider whether, in its opinion, there is a reasonable prospect of the appeal being successful (either in whole or in part).

Permission to appeal or to suspend a sanction may be given in relation to the whole or any specified part of the finding or sanction.

**References to the First-tier Tribunal for action in respect of misconduct**

An Ethical Standards Officer may refer the matters which are subject to the investigation to the First-tier Tribunal for adjudication.

A standards committee may refer a case to the First-Tier Tribunal for determination where it considers that the action it could take against a member is insufficient and the First-tier Tribunal agrees to accept the referral.

---

**Appeals to the Upper Tribunal**

**Member appeal** - Where the First-tier Tribunal decides that a member has failed to comply with the Code of Conduct, the member may, within 28 days of being notified of that decision seek permission to appeal against that decision to the Upper Tribunal (Administrative Appeals Chamber). The member must first apply to the First-tier Tribunal for permission to appeal.

**Appeal by Others** - Either party can seek to appeal the decision of the First-tier Tribunal to the Upper Tribunal (Administrative Appeals Chamber) if they can show there was an error of law made in that decision. The party wishing to appeal must first apply to the First-tier Tribunal for permission to appeal. This must be made in writing within 28 days after the First-tier Tribunal has sent written reasons for its decision.

On receiving an application for permission to appeal the First-tier Tribunal may decide to review its decision, if it is satisfied there was an error of law. If the First-tier Tribunal decides not to review its decision, it will then consider whether to give permission to appeal the decision to the Upper Tribunal.
If the First-tier Tribunal refuses permission to appeal to the Upper Tribunal the party has a right to make an application directly to the Upper Tribunal for permission to appeal no later than a month after receiving that refusal decision.

Additionally, where the First-tier Tribunal decides that a member has failed to comply with the Code of Conduct, the member may also within 28 days of being notified of that decision seek permission to appeal against the finding of failure to comply with a code of conduct or the imposition of any sanction. Again the member must first apply to the First-tier Tribunal for permission to appeal.
REPORT TO THE STANDARDS COMMITTEE OF RUGBY BOROUGH COUNCIL

BY KEVIN DOUGLAS, INDEPENDENT INVESTIGATOR

AUGUST 2010

SUBJECT: COMPLAINTS BY MS D GROVES, CLERK TO LONGLAWFORD PARISH COUNCIL AGAINST COUNCILLOR MRS P WYATT OF LONG LAWFORD PARISH COUNCIL ALLEGING BREACHES OF THE PARISH COUNCIL’S CODE OF CONDUCT FOR MEMBERS

1. Executive Summary

A. Complaints made on 23rd November 2008

1.1 On 23rd November 2008 Ms D Groves, Clerk to Long Lawford Parish Council submitted a number of complaints to the Standards Committee of Rugby Borough Council (Schedule 1 – Document 1) against Councillor Mrs P Wyatt, a member of Long Lawford Parish Council alleging breaches of the Parish Council’s Code of Conduct for Members as follows:

1.1.1 Paragraph 3(1) of the Code provides that a Councillor must treat others with respect

COMPLAINT 1: The complainant alleges that Mrs Wyatt failed to treat her with respect in that, over a period of 6 months, she made unreasonable and excessive personal attacks on her through public criticism, disrespect and challenges to her integrity at meetings of the Parish Council and through rude and discourteous emails.

1.1.2 Paragraphs 3(2)(b) of the Code provides that a Councillor must not bully any person and Paragraph 3(2)(c) provides that a Councillor must not intimidate or attempt to intimidate any person who is likely to be –

(i) a complainant,
(ii) a witness, or
(iii) involved in the administration of any investigation or proceedings

in relation to an allegation that a member has failed to comply with the authority’s Code of Conduct.

COMPLAINT 2: The complainant alleges that Mrs Wyatt has attempted to undermine her and intimidate her in a way which is detrimental to her confidence and capability and which is adversely affecting her health and that she was being personally criticised in an offensive manner.

1.1.3 Paragraph 3(2)(d) of the Code provides that a Councillor must not do anything which compromises or is likely to compromise the impartiality of those who work for, or on behalf of, their authority.

COMPLAINT 3: The complainant alleges that Mrs Wyatt - as a member of Rugby in Plume (a lobby/ action group which closely monitors and comments upon the operations and environmental impact of the Rugby cement company, Cemex) and
as a close associate of Mrs L Pallikaropoulos, a leading figure in Rugby in Plume, who
on occasions has attended meetings of the Parish Council when issues concerning
Cemex have been considered and caused disruption to such meetings – has
challenged the accuracy of the minutes describing those disruptions in order to
discriminate against Cemex and make them more favourable to Mrs Pallikaropoulos.
Also, that Mrs Wyatt through her challenges to the accuracy of minutes relating to
Cemex has attempted to compromise the impartiality of the complainant by putting
pressure on her to record minutes in a way which is biased against Cemex.

1.1.4 Paragraph 4(a) of the Code provides that a Councillor must not disclose
information given in confidence by anyone, or information acquired which the
councillor believes, or ought reasonably to be aware, is of a confidential nature,
except where ......

COMPLAINT 4: The complainant alleges that at a Parish Council meeting on 14th
October 2008, when in public session, Mrs Wyatt questioned why the Parish Council
was paying the Clerk £23.50 per month for the provision of broadband, which was
part of the Clerk’s terms and conditions of employment and which therefore was
confidential.

1.1.5 Paragraph 6(a) of the Code provides that members must not use or attempt to use
their position as a member improperly to confer on or secure for themselves or
any other person, an advantage or disadvantage.

COMPLAINT 5: The complainant alleges that after the meeting of the Parish Council
on 14th October 2008, Mrs Wyatt sent to Mrs L Pallikaropoulos a copy of a note
produced for the Parish Council by its Vice-Chairman with his observations and
objections to a planning application by Cemex. The Vice-Chairman’s observations
and objections to the application were agreed by the Parish Council but it was
resolved to circulate a draft of the proposed response to all members to give them
the opportunity to add their own comments, after which the formal response by the
Parish Council on the application would be brought back to the next meeting for
approval. Following receipt of the note from Mrs Wyatt, Mrs Pallikaropoulos
contacted the local press and provided them with a copy of what she purported to
be the Parish Council’s response to the planning application.

1.1.6 Paragraph 9(1) of the Code provides that, subject to a number of
exceptions/qualifications, where a member has a personal interest in any business
of the authority and he attends a meeting of the authority at which the business is
considered, he must disclose to that meeting the existence and nature of that
interest ...........

Paragraph 10(1) of the Code provides that, subject to a number of
exceptions/qualifications, where you have a personal interest in any business of
your 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.

Paragraph 12(1)(a) of the Code provides that, subject to the qualification regarding
making representations, answering questions or giving evidence, where a member
has a prejudicial interest in any business of his authority he must withdraw from the room where a meeting considering the business is being held, unless he has obtained a dispensation.

COMPLAINT 6: The complainant alleges that at a meeting of the Parish Council on 11th November 2008 when a Cemex planning application was on the agenda, Mrs Wyatt failed to declare a personal and prejudicial interest in the planning application in view of her membership of Rugby in Plume which was publicly opposed to Cemex and its planning application.

1.2 In accordance with Section 57(A)(2) of the Local Government Act 2000 (as amended), the Assessment Sub-Committee of the Standards Committee decided to refer all of the allegations for investigation. Initially the Sub-Committee wished the investigation to be referred to and undertaken by the Standards Board for England because of Mrs Wyatt’s membership of the Standards Committee as a Parish Council’s representative, which it believed would make it too difficult for the authority itself to deal with. However, the Standards Board referred it back for local investigation.

B. Complaints made on 12th February 2009

1.3 On the 12th February 2009, Ms D Groves submitted further complaints against Councillor Mrs Wyatt (Schedule 1 – Document 2) alleging various breaches of the Code of Conduct. The Assessment Sub-Committee conducted an assessment of these complaints at its meeting on 25th February 2009 and in accordance with Section 57(A)(2) decided to take no further action on any of the complaints with the exception of the complaint that Mrs Wyatt failed to treat the complainant with respect at a meeting of the Parish Council on 13th January 2009 when she remarked “does the Clerk rule what this Parish Council does?” which could amount to a breach of Paragraph 3(1) of the Code of Conduct - A member must treat others with respect. Again, initially, the Assessment Sub-Committee wished to refer investigation of this allegation to the Standards Board for England because of Mrs Wyatt’s membership of the Standards Committee. The allegation was referred back for local investigation. The Monitoring Officer agreed that the investigation of this further complaint should be carried out together with the complaints first made on 23rd November 2008.

1.4 From my investigation of these complaints, my conclusions are that, for the reasons outlined in detail further within this report:

- Councillor Mrs Wyatt did fail to treat the complainant with respect.
- Whilst Mrs Wyatt could not be said to have been in a position of authority or power within the Council so as, for example, to threaten the Clerk’s future employment, her actions and their effect on the complainant’s health and well-being did nevertheless constitute bullying. However, since the provision in the Code of Conduct regarding intimidation relates specifically to circumstances where the person intimidated is a complainant or a witness in relation to an allegation of a
breach of the Code, and the behaviour complained of pre-dates these complaints, it did not as such constitute the type of intimidation covered in Paragraph 3(2)(c).

- I have concluded also that Mrs Wyatt’s actions in attempting to amend minutes to reflect better on Mrs Pallikaropoulos and to Cemex’s disadvantage were not attempts to compromise the impartiality of the complainant or cause the complainant to act with bias against Cemex.

- I have concluded, however, that Mrs Wyatt’s action in identifying and querying, at a Parish Council meeting held in public, the payment to the Clerk for the provision of Broadband did breach the confidentiality provisions of the Code, and was another example of her failure to treat the Clerk with respect.

- I have concluded that Mrs Wyatt did not use her position improperly to confer an advantage or disadvantage on anyone when supplying Mrs Pallikaropoulos with a copy of the Vice-Chairman’s note of his observations and objections to the Cemex planning application, and passing them off as the Parish Council’s formal response to the application.

- Finally with regard to the complaints of the 23rd November 2008, I have concluded that since Mrs Wyatt did declare a personal interest, as a member of Rugby in Plume, in the item concerning the Cemex planning application at the meeting on 11th November 2008 and since, in my view, she had no need to declare a prejudicial interest in the item and therefore was entitled to remain in the meeting and participate, there was no breach of Paragraphs 9 or 10 of the Code of Conduct.

- With regard to the complaint made on 12th February 2009, I have concluded that Mrs Wyatt did not treat the Clerk with respect when at a meeting of the Parish Council on 13th January 2009, during a discussion regarding the provision of double white lines on the A428 in the vicinity of its junction with Livingstone Avenue, she remarked “or does the Clerk rule what this Parish Council does” after replying to the Chairman that what she was proposing was that the issue of the double white lines be re-addressed.

1.5 My findings, therefore, in summary, are:

- that the behaviour complained of at sub-paragraphs 1.1.1 and 1.1.2 above does involve breaches of Paragraphs 3(1) and 3(2)(b) respectively of the Code of Conduct (viz. a councillor must treat others with respect and a councillor must not bully any person) but not Paragraph 3(2)(c) (viz. a councillor must not intimidate any person who is likely to be a complainant in relation to an allegation of a breach of the Code of Conduct);

- that confidential information was publicly and inappropriately disclosed, as alleged at sub-paragraph 1.1.4 above, which constitutes a breach of Paragraph 4 (a) of the Code of Conduct;

- that the three allegations at sub-paragraphs 1.1.3, 1.1.5 and 1.1.6 do not constitute breaches of the respective paragraphs of the Code of Conduct as identified above; and
• that the allegation at sub-paragraph 1.3 above that Mrs Wyatt failed to treat the Clerk with respect at a meeting of the Parish Council on 13th January when remarking “does the Clerk rule what the Parish Council does” does constitute a breach of Paragraph 3(1) of the Code of Conduct.

2. Subject of the Complaint – Councillor Mrs P Wyatt

2.1 Councillor Mrs Wyatt was elected as a member of Long Lawford Parish Council in May 2006 for a four year term. She signed her declaration of acceptance of office as a councillor on 9th May 2006. This included Mrs Wyatt’s undertaking to observe the Parish Council’s Code of Conduct for Members. [Schedule 1 – Document 3]

2.2 Councillor Mrs Wyatt has served on the Parish Council for some 30 years, including a term as Chairman of the Council in 2002. From 2002 to 2006 she was also a member of Rugby Borough Council. Since 2006 she has served on Rugby Borough Council’s Standards Committee as one of the Parish Councils’ representatives.

2.3 Mrs Wyatt has attended several training courses on parish council administration provided by the Warwickshire Association of Local Councils (WALC) and on the Members’ Code of Conduct provided by the Borough Council’s Monitoring Officer.

2.4 Examination of Mrs Wyatt’s most up to date Register of Interests notification form dated 20th January 2009 (ie. prior to any fresh notification made since the Parish Council elections in May 2010) shows that she is a member, either in her own right or as nominee or representative of other bodies (viz. Parish Council, WALC, Rugby Borough Council) of numerous outside bodies and organisations. Most notably, in addition to her membership of the Standards Committee referred to above, Mrs Wyatt is a member of WALC (local area committee and county representative), Rugby in Plume, Rugby Community Cement Forum and Sub Group, Rugby Tyre Burning Review Group, Sustainable Rugby Management Committee and Working Group, Livingstone Avenue Householders’ Association (Secretary and Treasurer).

3. Conduct of the Investigation

3.1 In the course of my investigation I have held meetings with the Clerk to the Parish Council, Ms D Groves, on two occasions. I had two meetings with Councillor Mrs Wyatt and I had separate meetings with the current Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Parish Council, Councillors Rye and Davison. I also held telephone interviews with the former Chairman of the Parish Council, Mr David Draper and the former Clerk, Mrs Jean Taylor. (Copies of my Notes of these meetings and telephone interviews are included in Schedule 1 – Documents 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11 and 13.)

3.2 This investigation has been complicated by the fact that the complaint itself dates from the end of November 2008 and relates to a period of some six months before that date. In addition, I became aware from the Clerk and the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of two further complaints against Mrs Wyatt to the Standards Committee – one by the Clerk in February 2009 and the other by the Clerk and five fellow councillors in October 2009 – which they assumed I had been instructed to investigate simultaneously with the November 2008 complaints. Mrs Wyatt was aware of the November 2008 and February 2009 complaints but not of the October 2009 complaint. As a result of this and the fact
that the behaviour complained of is allegedly continuing up to the present day, the accounts given at all the meetings I have conducted and the evidence gleaned from those meetings has ranged from the pre-November 2008 period right up to the present time.

3.3 In view of this the Monitoring Officer issued further instructions to me on 29th April 2010 to investigate the one element of the Clerk’s complaint from February 2009 which the Assessment Sub-Committee had referred for investigation, together with the November 2008 complaints. She advised me that the October 2009 complaint was to be the subject of mediationconciliation measures. The result of my simultaneous investigation of the second complaint of 12th February 2009 is contained within this report.

4. Evidence Gathered

COMPLAINTS 1 and 2

4.1 The Clerk complains that over a period of approximately 6 months (therefore, from June 2008), she was subjected to unreasonable and excessive personal attack by Mrs Wyatt through being publicly criticised at meetings of the Parish Council; being shown no respect; and by having her integrity questioned. Also, she complains that the tone in many of Mrs Wyatt’s e-mails to her was rude and discourteous. She claims that Mrs Wyatt has attempted to undermine her and intimidate her in a way which is detrimental to her confidence and capability and which is adversely affecting her health. The Clerk complains that as an officer of the Council, she was being personally criticised in an offensive manner. (Copies of e-mails and notes are included in Schedule 1 – Document 4)

4.2 In support of her allegations, the Clerk has provided copies of the minutes of the Parish Council meetings on 10th June 2008, 8th July 2008, 9th September 2008, 14th October 2008 and 11th November 2008. (Schedule 1 - Document 4)

- The significance of the 10th June meeting, in which there are no challenges to the Clerk by Mrs Wyatt, seems to me to be that it is the beginning of the breakdown in relations stemming from the challenges by the then Chairman, Mr D Draper, during the “public participation” item to Mrs L Pallikaropoulos, a leading member of Rugby in Plume and a close associate of Mrs Wyatt, who wished to speak, and the way in which the Clerk minuted that exchange and the occasion itself, with references to disruptions caused by Mrs Pallikaropoulos at previous Parish Council meetings.

- At the meeting on 8th July the minutes show that Mrs Wyatt circulated a note calling for amendments to the way in which the exchanges between the Chairman and Mrs Pallikaropoulos and the incident itself were minuted. Mrs Wyatt’s proposed amendments were not supported by the Council. Later in the meeting under the “Councillors Reports and Items for Future Agenda” item there is a question by Mrs Wyatt regarding the Internal Auditors report and why it had not been seen by the Parish Council. The Clerk replied that “it had been seen by the Finance Committee of which Mrs Wyatt was a member” and went on to comment that Mrs Wyatt had not attended the previous four meetings and had only submitted apologies for the last meeting. The contents, it is minuted, had been “fully discussed and reported back to full Council”.
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• At the meeting on 9th September the minutes show that Mrs Wyatt raised a litany of corrections and proposed amendments to the minutes of the July meeting. She had circulated a document listing the items she was challenging. All the text within the document was in "upper-case". Having received no support from Councillors for any of the proposed amendments, the next item in the minutes under "To Receive Progress Reports on Outstanding Items Not Covered Later on the Agenda" shows a series of items raised by Mrs Wyatt challenging and querying the Clerk and Chairman over different issues. The minutes later recount the then Chairman’s experiences of being the subject of complaints to the Standards Board for England by Mrs Pallikaropoulos following the exchanges at the June and July 2008 meetings referred to above, and his criticism of the part played by Mrs Wyatt in this matter.

• The minutes of the 14th October 2008 Parish Council meeting show that Mrs Wyatt challenged the minute relating to the discussion of the former Chairman’s experiences of the Code of Conduct complaint process and specifically asked why the letter from the former Chairman to her, which the Vice-Chairman had read out at the meeting, was not recorded in full. It should be noted that the former Chairman, Mr Draper, had resigned from the Parish Council since the previous meeting on 9th September 2008. It was at this meeting that the Cemex climafuel manufacturing facility was first considered by the Parish Council. The Vice-Chairman had circulated a note containing his comments on and his suggested objections to the application. These were fully supported by the Parish Council but the minutes show that before the Parish Council’s formal observations were submitted to the Local Planning Authority, all members would be given an opportunity to add their own comments which would be incorporated in a draft formal response and brought to the next Parish Council meeting for approval. This issue becomes the next significant point of dispute between the Clerk (and the Council) and Mrs Wyatt whose recollection of the agreement reached at that meeting, detailed later in this report, is different from the approved record.

• The Minutes of the meeting of the Parish Council held on 11th November 2008 show Mrs Wyatt challenging the accuracy of the minute relating to the consideration of the Cemex climafuel application. Mrs Wyatt maintained that the Council resolved to accept the Vice-Chairman’s comments and objections as its response to the application and that the remainder of the recorded minute regarding other councillors being given the opportunity to add further comments and the draft formal response being brought back to the next meeting for approval, did not in fact transpire. The Parish Council did not accept Mrs Wyatt’s proposal that the minute was inaccurate and went on to approve the minute as a correct record. The next item of these minutes under "To Receive Progress Reports on Outstanding Items Not Covered Later on the Agenda" records, again, a litany of issues raised by Mrs Wyatt querying, challenging and criticising matters affecting the Clerk’s or the Chairman’s actions.

4.3 The Clerk and the current Chairman, Councillor Rye, have said that the constant challenges, queries and criticisms at meetings over the accuracy of minutes; of advice provided by the Clerk on procedure; of actions taken following on from meetings and over the despatch and receipt of agenda and minutes and other communications, which all
other councillors have confirmed have been received, but which Mrs Wyatt would claim not to have received, so questioning the Clerk’s honesty and integrity and her professionalism, have seriously affected the Clerk’s confidence and her health and wellbeing. The Vice-Chairman in his interview expressed the view that Mrs Wyatt had always behaved this way towards Clerks and he believed that past Clerks had resigned because of it. The former Clerk, Mrs J Taylor, intimated as much when saying she had felt that she did not seem to be able to do anything right in Mrs Wyatt’s eyes. She said she was always challenging the Clerk and the Chairman and that all previous Clerks had received the same treatment and in that sense it was not personal, but it was very tiring. The present Clerk, the complainant, had made the very same point in her interview. For her part, Mrs Wyatt said that she did not consider querying the accuracy of minutes when they did not reflect what she recalled as being the correct record, to be bullying. Neither, when saying she had not received agenda and minutes and other communications, was she necessarily being critical of the Clerk by inferring that they had not been delivered or sent to her, she was simply stating that she could not put her hands on them – more a self-criticism of her own filing system. The Clerk has stated that Mrs Wyatt has never stated that she simply couldn’t put her hands on her agenda or minutes, but always that she had not had them.

4.4 The Clerk has complained that in Mrs Wyatt’s e-mail communications with her and in other documents circulated at meetings, Mrs Wyatt used a sometimes rude, sometimes bullying and intimidating tone and style. In some of these e-mails there was the use of capital letters for certain words which the Clerk interpreted as denoting shouting and threatening language. (Examples of such e-mails and other documents can be seen in Document 4 of Schedule 1.) Mrs Wyatt has said she would use capitals in e-mails and letters for certain words for the purpose of highlighting a point or for the sake of emphasis. She did not intend them to be derogatory or to signify shouting. The other documents referred to were her own aide-memoirs for matters she wanted to raise at Parish Council meetings. These were generally always typed in “upper-case” so that she herself could read them. She had circulated copies of these documents at Parish Council meetings to assist the Chairman and others in following her points and to assist the Clerk in recording them, not to bully or intimidate anyone.

4.5 In his interview, the Chairman, Councillor Rye, praised the work that the Clerk had done in introducing correct procedures and improved practices at meetings and in the administration of the Council. When she became Clerk there had been a succession of Acting Clerks (councillors) and numerous things were not being done correctly. Councillor Rye said he believed much of the criticism and negativity from Mrs Wyatt was because she objected to having to comply with correct practice and proper procedures. The Clerk said that she believed that Mrs Wyatt’s attitude towards her changed when it became clear that in matters concerning Cemex she would only ever act in an unbiased and correct manner and would not accept simply what Mrs Wyatt would say regardless.

4.6 For her part, Mrs Wyatt has said that she believes she is being badly treated by the Chairman and the Clerk because of her involvement with Cemex issues and that she has been humiliated at Parish Council meetings with the Clerk and the Chairman being rude to her. Other councillors, because they were mostly new, had not felt able to defend or support her. Mrs Wyatt provided me with copies of testimonials/references from five parishioners praising her unstinted service to the community as a councillor and
condemning the allegations against her. One in particular, from Borough and County Councillor Mrs C Watson, a parish councillor until January 2009, expresses concern at the disrespectful behaviour of the Clerk, Chairman and other councillors towards Mrs Wyatt at Parish Council meetings and the impatience displayed when she attempts to query or challenge the accuracy of minutes or the advice provided on standing orders and regulations. (Copies of testimonials/references Schedule 1 Document 12) The Clerk has commented on the motivation of Councillor Watson in making her statement which can be seen in the note of her second interview. (Schedule 1 Document 13) Although, Councillor Watson’s testimony relates to the very recent period and not the period covered by this investigation, it indicates an ongoing deterioration which dates from the period of the first complaints.

4.7 The inspection of the Parish Council’s accounts generally and during the 2006/07 and 2007/08 annual external audit of accounts has been an issue between Mrs Wyatt and the Clerk and the cause of friction. Generally, the Clerk has introduced a spreadsheet which details all invoices and payments due and which she submits to the Parish Council each month for approval prior to cheques being signed. Each quarter she submits a Bank Reconciliation report for approval by the Parish Council and prior to this a meeting of the Finance Committee/Panel is held to examine and agree the report. For any member who wishes to do so, all invoices are available for inspection prior to Parish Council meetings. These practices are based on advice from the Society of Local Council Clerks (SLCC) and WALC. Mrs Wyatt does not consider that this system of financial control is adequate, however, and prefers the previous arrangement whereby all invoices would be examined by councillors at the meetings. She does not believe it is acceptable or reasonable for a member to inspect invoices prior to the start of a meeting, potentially causing a delayed start. She does not consider the Finance Committee/Panel to be properly run; it being convened at short notice, having no formal agenda and with no minutes being kept. (The Clerk has commented that at this time minutes of the Finance Committee were kept and meetings were not convened at short notice.) Although a member, she had only attended one meeting in recent times, because meetings often clashed with meetings of the Rugby Cement Community Forum of which she was also a member. On the occasion she did attend and asked to see the accounts and the invoices she was only shown the summary spreadsheet and was made to feel guilty for asking. (The Clerk has commented that Mrs Wyatt certainly did not ask to see the invoices. Each member was given the accounts spreadsheet and bank reconciliation documents and the bank statement was shown.) For this reason, when the notices of the Annual Audit of Accounts for both 2006/07 and 2007/08 were published she wanted to exercise her right to inspect the accounts. Her attempts are recounted in the e-mail exchanges of July 2007 and July 2008 (Schedule 1 Document 4). The Clerk has demonstrated that in an e-mail reply of 13th July 2007 to Mrs Wyatt’s e-mail of 6th July 2007, she provided Mrs Wyatt with alternative dates when the accounts could be made available for her to inspect. She has noted that Mrs Wyatt did not reply and did not arrange to come and view the accounts. Mrs Wyatt has commented that because the e-mail response from the Clerk was under the heading “Re: Finance Committee Meeting” – a meeting for which she had already apologised – she probably did not scroll down far enough to see the substantive response with the alternative dates offered for inspecting the accounts. The Clerk has made the point that it was in Mrs
Wyatt's reply of 6th July 2007 giving her apologies for that Finance Committee meeting, that she went on to ask for arrangements to be made for her to inspect the accounts. The e-mail exchanges between 15th and 16th July 2008 regarding the inspection of the 2007/08 accounts culminated in Mrs Wyatt telephoning the Clerk on the evening of the 15th July 2008 demanding to see the accounts at 12 noon the following day. After the Clerk explained why that would not be possible, she maintains that Mrs Wyatt began shouting down the phone at her demanding that she be allowed to view the accounts. The Clerk advised Mrs Wyatt that "she was not about to get into an argument with her about it and suggested that if she wanted to complain she should speak with the Chairman". Mrs Wyatt has stated that she did not recall shouting at the Clerk down the telephone. She has commented that she was unaware that she shouted at anyone down the phone, and that perhaps it had something to do with a hearing disability, and so she did not realise if she was shouting – a matter, she said, she would try to be aware of in the future. Mrs Wyatt commented that she did get frustrated by all the trouble she had to go through to get to see something she believed she was entitled to. The Chairman had advised Mrs Wyatt that it would probably be possible to view the accounts during the following week and advised her to telephone the Clerk to make arrangements. The Clerk has stated that she heard nothing more from Mrs Wyatt about this until after she gave notice in September 2008 that the "External Auditors Statement of Accounts" was available for inspection. Mrs Wyatt e-mailed the Clerk on 15th and 16th September 2008 asking if an appointment could be made to "view the accounts" on 17th September 2008. The Clerk responded on 16th September confirming the appointment with Mrs Wyatt to view the "External Auditors Statement of Accounts". At this meeting, Mrs Wyatt was shown the External Auditors Statement of Accounts only, which she said was not what she wanted to see. As is clear from her e-mail request, Mrs Wyatt wanted to view the Parish Council Accounts. Because the timing of this request coincided with the public notice of the External Auditors Statement of Accounts, the Clerk either misunderstood the request or considered that that was what Mrs Wyatt was only entitled to see.

**COMPLAINT 3**

4.8 The Clerk has stated that she believes the menacing way in which Mrs Wyatt constantly challenged the accuracy of the minutes regarding Cemex and Mrs Pallikaropoulos were attempts by her to put pressure on the Clerk not to record the true facts and so compromise her impartiality. The Clerk has referred to the e-mail from Mrs Wyatt dated 6th October 2008 as evidence of her attempts to coerce and intimidate the Clerk by giving advance notice of her intention to challenge the accuracy of the minutes of the previous Parish Council meeting. She has also submitted the aide-memoirs (in capital letters) produced by Mrs Wyatt for the meetings on 8th July and 9th September 2008 and has cited the minutes of the meetings of 8th July, 9th September, 14th October and 11th November 2008 as evidence.

4.9 Mrs Wyatt has stated that she did not regard her challenges to the accuracy of minutes as being bullying or intimidating behaviour. The challenges, she maintained, were based on her recall of discussions and agreements at meetings and she was not prepared to accept
inaccuracies. The two documents were produced and used by her as aide-memoirs for the meetings in question. They were produced using capital letters for her own benefit so that she could read them more easily, not to intimidate or bully the Clerk. She stated that they were circulated at the meetings to assist the Chairman, Members and Clerk in following her points and ultimately in recording them. (The Clerk maintains that the members were not provided with a copy of Mrs Wyatt’s notes. Only she was given copies.)

COMPLAINT 4

4.10 The Minutes of the meeting of the Parish Council on 14th October 2008 (Min 08-10/12) record that Mrs Wyatt asked why the Parish Council was paying the Clerk £23.50 per month for provision of Broadband. This was raised whilst the Council was in public session. Mrs Wyatt was advised that this was a private and confidential matter agreed as part of the Clerk’s terms and conditions at the commencement of her employment and should not be discussed in public. The information which Mrs Wyatt was querying was contained in the monthly item containing the list of Accounts for Payment and was itemised as “Telecoms Oct ..........£23.50”.

4.11 Mrs Wyatt stated that she raised the matter because there had been issues over the publication of the Clerk’s e-mail address and also because she wanted the Council to consider having a website which was a requirement for achieving Quality Parish status. She said she raised the matter because she wanted to make the point that public money was being used for the Clerk’s computer and e-mail facilities but the public were not benefiting from it. In fact, the monthly telecoms expenses represented a contribution of £7.50 towards the Clerk’s broadband costs and £16.00 towards the cost of telephone calls. In commenting on my draft report, Mrs Wyatt has stated that she questioned why the Parish Council was paying for broadband—not the Clerk—which did not allow the facility to be of any benefit to the residents. In my response to Mrs Wyatt, I have pointed out that the Minutes of the meeting show clearly that she questioned why the Parish Council was paying the Clerk amount for broadband and that the Minutes are the evidence that I must rely on, in this and every other instance.

4.12 In the Vice-Chairman’s evidence he maintained that Mrs Wyatt raised such questions publicly in order to attack and humiliate the Clerk. The Chairman believed that Mrs Wyatt’s purpose in raising the issue was both to embarrass the Clerk and to challenge the need for it. He advised that the Clerk’s home was in effect the Parish Council’s office but Mrs Wyatt had long wanted the Parish Council to establish an office in the Memorial Hall. The Council had use of a room in the Hall to store its records but it could not be used as an office because the Hall’s Trustees could not allow the installation of a telephone line.

COMPLAINT 5

4.13 The Clerk has alleged that Mrs Wyatt used her position improperly when she sent to Mrs Pallikaropoulos a copy of a note by the Vice-Chairman of the Parish Council with his comments and proposed objections to the Cemex climafuel planning application, which was considered by
the Parish Council at its meeting on 14th October 2008. Mrs Wyatt passed this on as the wording of the Parish Council's approved response objecting to the application. Mrs Pallikaropoulos subsequently passed it to the local press as the Council’s response. The editor then contacted the Chairman only to be told that the Parish Council had not finalised its response and would not do so until its next meeting. It is alleged that Mrs Wyatt took this action in order to advantage Mrs Pallikaropoulos and Rugby in Plume and their campaign against the planning application to the disadvantage of Cemex.

4.14 The Chairman has stated that he wrote to each member of the Parish Council asking whether they had forwarded the document to Mrs Pallikaropoulos. All members except Mrs Wyatt, replied saying they hadn't. Mrs Wyatt had not confirmed or denied it. The Clerk, however, has submitted copy e-mails dated 16th October 2008 between Mrs Wyatt and Mrs Pallikaropoulos and Mrs Pallikaropoulos and the Editor of the Rugby Times, which were obtained from the editor, and which confirm that Mrs Wyatt did indeed forward the document. The Vice-Chairman confirmed that his document was not marked "confidential" but that at that point in time when they were forwarded on by Mrs Wyatt, it did not represent the formal finalised response of the Parish Council.

4.15 Mrs Wyatt has stated that she recalls very clearly that the Parish Council accepted the Vice-Chairman's comments and objections and approved them on the night because of the time-limit on submitting comments to the Local Planning Authority. She was delighted with the decision as were those members of the public present. As far as she and they were concerned that was the Council's formal decision. This view is supported in the letter of reference/testimony from Mr Roper. Mrs Wyatt was adamant that the eventual minute of that item which talked about giving other members the opportunity of adding their own comments and bringing a draft response back to the November meeting for finalisation and approval did not transpire at the meeting. At the November meeting she strongly challenged the accuracy of that minute, but to no avail. The minutes were accepted as a true record.

4.16 The Clerk in an e-mail to all Parish Councillors on 8th November 2008 regarding this matter indicated, amongst other things, that when she queried at the meeting on 14th October whether the timescale for submitting comments on the planning application would allow for the delay to the next meeting, Councillor Mrs Watson advised that observations would be accepted right up to the day before the application went to committee. On this basis, the decision was made to defer the approval of the final, formal response to the November meeting.

COMPLAINT 6

4.17 The Clerk has alleged that at the meeting of the Parish Council on 11th November 2008 when the Council considered the Cemex climafuel planning application, Mrs Wyatt failed to declare a personal and prejudicial interest in the planning application, as a member of Rugby in Plume who were publicly against Cemex and its planning application. Mrs Wyatt failed to leave the meeting when the application was discussed and proposed the objections to be submitted against the application.

4.18 Mrs Wyatt has stated that she did declare a personal interest in the Cemex planning application as a member of Rugby in Plume. She did not consider that she had a prejudicial interest in it and she believed that her interest was one which she shared with the public generally.
4.19 The minutes of the meeting held on 11th November 2008 (Min 08/11/04) show that Mrs Wyatt did declare “a personal interest in Rugby in Plume if discussed at item 8.A.e”. Item 8.A.e did indeed relate to the Cemex climafuel planning application. Mrs Wyatt had similarly declared a personal interest at the 14th October 2008 meeting when the planning application was first considered.

COMPLAINT OF 12TH FEBRUARY 2009

4.20 An item was included on the agenda for the Parish Council meeting on 13th January 2009 at Mrs Wyatt's request headed "Double White Lines on the A428". The item had been on the agenda previously in August 2007 when the Parish Council had agreed to submit a request to County Highways for the provision of double white lines on the A428 in order to prohibit overtaking in the vicinity of the Livingstone Avenue junction. At the meeting on 13th January 2009 Mrs Wyatt asked for a progress report on the matter. The Clerk reported that after chasing up the matter for several weeks some months previously, the County Council had finally confirmed to her that double white lines would not be introduced along that part of the A428 because there were other areas where more accidents had occurred which were a higher priority. Mrs Wyatt stated that the matter should be re-addressed and re-submitted to the County Council. The Chairman asked what she was proposing and Mrs Wyatt stated that she was proposing that the issue of double white lines on the A428 in the vicinity of its junction with Livingstone Avenue be re-addressed and added the remark "or does the Clerk rule what this Parish Council does?".

4.21 Mrs Wyatt told me that when she asked for the case for the double white lines to be put forward again, the Clerk had dismissed the idea saying that the County Council had advised that it wasn’t a priority. Mrs Wyatt wanted the Parish Council to re-address the issue and re-submit it and added the comment “or was the Clerk now running the Council”! She said that she said this out of frustration. She also told me that since then, she had pursued the issue on her own and had now had a favourable response from the County Council. She believed the Parish Council could have continued to press for it.

4.22 The Clerk has said that she was not dismissive of the matter, she was simply being matter of fact in reporting back the County Council’s response. The Chairman had had to warn Mrs Wyatt not to make further comments against the Clerk.

4.23 In her comments on my draft report, Mrs Wyatt has said that with hindsight she should have refrained from saying such words and that she is extremely sorry this happened.

5. Consideration and Evaluation of Evidence and Conclusions

COMPLAINTS 1 AND 2

5.1 The revised 2007 Code of Conduct for Members introduced the separate provision under Paragraphs 3(2)(b) and (c) regarding bullying and intimidation. Prior to this, incidents of bullying were dealt with under the broader provision of Paragraph 3(1) that members
must treat others with respect. This new provision was introduced as a result of the concerns of the Standards Board for England and its Ethical Standards Officers with the recurring problem of bullying of officers by some members. They were particularly concerned by the apparently significant problem of bullying and harassment occurring at parish level between Members and the Clerk, which was exacerbated by the relatively isolated, and therefore vulnerable, position of the Clerk.

5.2 The Standards for England Guide to the Code of Conduct characterises bullying as offensive, intimidating, malicious, insulting or humiliating behaviour, which may happen once or be part of a pattern of behaviour directed at a person over whom you have some actual or perceived influence. Bullying behaviour attempts to undermine an individual, is detrimental to their confidence and capability, and may adversely affect their health. This does not mean that officers’ views and performance cannot be challenged. There have been cases where officers, and particularly Clerks to Parish Councils, have been oversensitive to criticism or have rejected reasonable criticism appropriately made and described it as bullying. It is not the purpose of the Code of Conduct to curtail members’ from probing and challenging poor officer performance, provided it is done in an appropriate way and in the right forum, such as in a private meeting and not a public one.

5.3 Examples of unacceptable behaviour and bullying can include:

- Intimidation/humiliation
- Excessive criticism
- Autocratic/dictatorial behaviour
- Shouting
- Browbeating
- Haranguing
- Ridiculing
- Expressions of intolerance
- General discourtesy

Bullying need not necessarily be face to face; it can be by written communications, e-mail and telephone.

5.4 The complainant in this case has submitted minutes of Parish Council meetings where challenges to the accuracy of the minutes have been pursued by Councillor Mrs Wyatt, without support from her fellow councillors. When failing to achieve the amendments she was seeking, Mrs Wyatt would invariably follow up with a litany of criticisms, queries and challenges to the Clerk. Mrs Wyatt has said that she could not accept incorrect minutes and did not see how challenging the accuracy of minutes could be regarded as bullying. I have considered whether in these instances the Clerk was over-sensitive to these criticisms and challenges. It is a normal part of Council and Committee procedure for amendments to be proposed and made before minutes are accepted as a correct record. Unfortunately, the more detailed narrative style of the minutes of Parish Council meetings, gives greater opportunity for challenge by members. However, despite that, I consider that, on balance, Mrs Wyatt’s challenges were motivated by a blinkered pro-Rugby in Plume and anti-Cemex mind-set and were largely unreasonable and unfounded. Subsequent challenges by her became antagonistic towards and demeaning of the Clerk.
and her competency and capability. In her comments on the draft report Mrs Wyatt has questioned how and why challenges to the accuracy of minutes can be regarded as personal attacks on the Clerk. In my response to her I have said that her persistence in openly and vigorously challenging the accuracy of the minutes goes beyond the occasional amendment of spelling or other grammatical errors, which in my experience was the norm, but that on occasions she was demanding wholesale re-writes of the minute. This was a regular challenge to the competency of the Clerk. At the end of the day, all of the minutes that Mrs Wyatt challenged were received as correct record and would stand up as such in a court of law.

5.5 There are several examples given in the minutes and through the various e-mails where Mrs Wyatt questioned whether the Clerk had done things or had sent things to her, or where she would ask for sight of evidence to support advice which the Clerk had given to the Council. The Clerk considers that these queries have challenged her honesty, integrity and competency and damaged her confidence. I consider that these challenges and queries have shown a lack of respect for the Clerk, particularly where they have been made at public meetings.

5.6 The Clerk has cited the use of capital letters by Mrs Wyatt in certain e-mails and documents as signifying shouting and threatening language. Mrs Wyatt has said in reply that she uses capital letters in e-mails for the purpose of emphasis or to highlight a point. The two documents referred to were all produced in capitals because they were documents for Mrs Wyatt’s own use at Parish Council meetings and they needed to be in capitals so that she could read and follow them. In relation to these particular documents, I accept Mrs Wyatt’s explanation. The use of capital letters was clearly for her own benefit. However, I believe that the selective use of capitals in certain e-mails sent to the Clerk, whilst they may have been used for the purpose of emphasis and highlighting, were nevertheless also intended to denote shouting instructions and demands or at least, if that was not the intention, that was how they were received. In her comments on the draft report, Mrs Wyatt asked how the use of capital letters can be interpreted as being rude, discourteous or bullying, and how I would interpret the use of bold type, italics or underscoring. In my response to her I have admitted that after my initial assessment of the documents concerned they did come not across as bullying or harassing, but on further reflection and in the light of all the evidence I came to the conclusion that the context within which the e-mails and notes were produced, viz. Mrs Wyatt’s efforts to examine the Parish Council’s accounts or to obtain re-writes of the minutes – did indicate to me that the use of capitals was intended to denote shouted instructions and demands, and were not simply for emphasis or to assist in their reading. To my mind, use of capital letters creates that effect far more than the use of italics or bold type, which is more about presentation and style.

5.7 The issue of the inspection of the Parish Council accounts has been a cause of friction between Mrs Wyatt and the Clerk. The Clerk had introduced new systems for reporting finance matters based on advice from SLCC and WALC. Mrs Wyatt preferred the old practice of considering each individual invoice and approving payments at Parish Council meetings. Because of this each year since 2007, at the time of the Annual Audit of Accounts, she has asked to inspect the accounts. Mrs Wyatt believes she has largely been frustrated in this by the Clerk and I have some sympathy with her in that respect. I think
that because Mrs Wyatt was a member of the Finance Committee/Panel and had the
opportunity to inspect the accounts regularly, but did not attend meetings, the Clerk has
viewed Mrs Wyatt's requests to inspect the accounts at the time of the Annual Audit of
Accounts as no different from any member of the public's. For example, the public notice
of the Audit of Accounts invites the public to telephone the Clerk to make an appointment
to view the accounts. So the Clerk expected Mrs Wyatt to telephone rather than e-mail.
Mrs Wyatt believed, correctly in my view, that she had a right to view the Parish Council's
accounts over and above the public's right at the time of the Annual Audit. Her
frustrations, in my view, led to her shouting at the Clerk down the telephone on the
evening of 15th July 2008. Whilst I can understand her frustrations and accept that they
offer some mitigation, I nevertheless have concluded that this was a further incidence of
bullying and lack of respect.

5.8 The complainant alleged that Mrs Wyatt's behaviour towards her was also in breach of
Paragraph 3(2)(c) of the Code of Conduct as identified at sub-paragraph 1.1.2 above. It will
be noted that this provision of the Code concerns the intimidation or attempted
intimidation of a person who is or is likely to be a complainant or a witness in relation to
an allegation that a member has failed to comply with the authority's Code of Conduct.
Given the timing of this particular complaint, it would not have been possible for Mrs
Wyatt to have breached this provision of the Code of Conduct.

COMPLAINT 3

5.9 The complainant claims that Mrs Wyatt's behaviour towards her in trying to achieve
changes to the way she recorded discussions and decisions concerning Rugby in Plume
and Cemex was intended to compromise her impartiality and put pressure on her to
record such matters in a biased way. From the evidence gathered, and despite Mrs
Wyatt's several attempts to get the record changed, I do not consider that she was
attempting to compromise the Clerk's impartiality or professionalism. I have concluded
therefore that there was no breach of Paragraph 3(2)(d) of the Code of Conduct.

COMPLAINT 4

5.10 Paragraph 4 (a) of the Code of Conduct says that a member must not disclose
information given in confidence by anyone, or information which the member believes or
ought reasonably to be aware, is of a confidential nature – except where certain exceptions
apply. Information is confidential:

- if it is about something serious and not trivial
- if the nature of the information is sensitive or personal
- if it is information that you would expect people would want to be private
- if it was divulged in a way which implied it should be kept confidential
- if disclosing the information would be detrimental to the person who wished to keep
  it confidential
If a Council or a Committee has agreed to treat information as confidential, then a member should maintain it as confidential.

At the meeting of the Parish Council on 14th October 2008, whilst in public session and with members of the public present, Mrs Wyatt asked why the Council was paying the Clerk £23.50 per month for the provision of Broadband. This payment was listed under the Accounts for Payment item on the agenda and identified as “Telecoms Oct .......£23.50”.

This was a payment made to the Clerk under her terms and conditions of employment agreed at the time of her appointment. The Council had always treated matters concerning the terms and conditions of its employees as confidential and would exclude the public if such matters were to be considered. In this respect therefore I consider that the detail and nature of this information was confidential.

In her comments on my draft report, Mrs Wyatt has said that these telecoms expenses were openly reported in the Agenda and Minutes and therefore they could be questioned and also that they would be open to inspection by the public at the time of the annual audit of accounts. My response to Mrs Wyatt has been that it was the fact that she revealed these payments as payments to the Clerk that resulted in a breach of confidentiality, because the detailed terms and conditions of the Clerk’s employment are confidential information. The fact that there is a monthly expense of £23.50 for telecoms is not confidential and any examination of the Parish Council’s accounts by the public would reveal that, but it would not necessarily reveal that it was a payment to the Clerk.

One of the exceptions to the bar on disclosing confidential information is that the disclosure is in the public interest. Mrs Wyatt has said that she raised the question about this payment to the Clerk because there had been issues over the publication of the Clerk’s e-mail address and she wanted to make the point that public money was being spent on the Clerk’s IT facilities but that the public was not benefiting from it. The Standards Board for England has issued advice on the tests that can be applied to determine whether disclosure of confidential information would be in the public interest. The reasons put forward by Mrs Wyatt do not pass those tests. None of the other exceptions to the bar on disclosure apply in this case. Therefore I conclude that Mrs Wyatt did disclose confidential information in breach of the Code of Conduct.

Although this may appear to some not to be a serious issue or to be trivial, in a small village this would be taken seriously and be a cause of embarrassment to the Clerk. I consider that by raising the matter in public Mrs Wyatt also failed to treat the Clerk with respect.

COMPLAINT 5

5.11 The complainant alleges that by sending Mrs Pallikaropoulos of Rugby in Plume a copy of the note circulated by the Vice-Chairman at the Parish Council meeting on 14th October 2008 and telling her that the comments and objections within that note were the approved Parish Council response on the Cemex climalfuel planning application, which they were not, but which Mrs Pallikaropoulos then forwarded to the local Press, Mrs Wyatt had used her
position as a councillor improperly in order to confer on or secure an advantage for Rugby in Plume and a disadvantage to Cemex, in breach of Paragraph 6 (a) of the Code of Conduct.

Mrs Wyatt maintains that the decision of the Parish Council was made at the meeting on 14th October and that it had approved the Vice-Chairman’s proposed comments and objections. She was delighted with the decision and it may be that she was distracted when the Council went on to delay its final decision to the next meeting to enable other councillors to add their own comments. However, the Vice-Chairman’s note was not marked confidential and so I do not see that it was an improper use of Mrs Wyatt’s position to let Mrs Pallikaropoulos have a copy of it, as a fellow member of Rugby in Plume. The fact that this was then passed to the local Press as the Parish Council’s approved response to the planning application is in my view largely academic. If the Press had been present at the meeting, they are just as likely to have reported that the Parish Council had agreed to object to the planning application. Therefore, I do not consider that Rugby in Plume was given any advantage nor that Cemex was put at a disadvantage. My conclusion is that there was no breach of Paragraph 6 (a) by Mrs Wyatt’s actions.

COMPLAINT 6

5.12 The complainant alleges that at a meeting of the Parish Council on 11th November 2008 when the Cemex planning application was considered, Mrs Wyatt failed to declare a personal and prejudicial interest in the planning application in view of her membership of Rugby in Plume. The relevant Paragraphs of the Code of Conduct are Paragraphs 9(1), 10(1) and 12(1)(a) as detailed at sub-paragraphs 1.1.6 above.

The minutes of the meeting held on 11th November 2008 show that Mrs Wyatt did declare a personal interest as a member of Rugby in Plume in the item concerning the Cemex application. Therefore, there was no breach of Paragraph 9(1) of the Code. The issue then is whether Mrs Wyatt had a prejudicial interest in the item. But this item did not relate to an application by or some financial matter concerning Mrs Wyatt or Rugby in Plume and the Code of Conduct provides that you do not have a prejudicial interest if the matter does not affect your financial interests or does not relate to a licensing or regulatory matter (eg. a planning application) brought by you or a body in which you have a personal interest. So Mrs Wyatt did not have a prejudicial interest under the Code of Conduct and did not need to leave the meeting under the provisions of Paragraph 12(1)(a) of the Code.

This matter has become confused with the concept of bias and pre-determination, which are not issues covered by the Code of Conduct. A decision taken by a Council could be challenged (through the High Court) if it was tainted by the involvement and participation of a member who was regarded as being biased or held a pre-determined view. Because of Mrs Wyatt’s membership of Rugby in Plume, it is probably fair to say that most people would regard her position, when considering matters concerning Cemex, as being biased and that she would not have an open mind. Whether Cemex would ever want to challenge a decision by the Parish Council to, for example, object to a planning application is questionable given that it would be the District or County Council which would be making the actual decision on the application. Whether Mrs Wyatt’s participation in such matters could be regarded as bringing the Parish Council into disrepute is moot.
I have concluded that there were no breaches of Paragraphs 10(1) or 12(1)(a) of the Code of Conduct in this matter.

COMPLAINT OF 12TH FEBRUARY 2009

5.13 There is no dispute that Mrs Wyatt did say "is the Clerk now running the Council" or words to that effect at the meeting on 13th January 2009 during the discussion of the double white lines issue. The minutes have it recorded as "or does the Clerk rule what this Parish does". The Chairman pulled Mrs Wyatt up on the comment because it was not something which the Clerk could respond to or defend herself from. Mrs Wyatt has said that she felt frustrated over the Clerk's dismissive approach to the issue. The Clerk has said she was just reporting back the facts as she had received them from the County Council.

My assessment of this situation is that Mrs Wyatt's remark was probably symptomatic of the state of the relationship between her and the Clerk by that time. Mrs Wyatt would by then have been aware of the complaints about her to the Standards Committee that the Clerk had made on 23rd November 2008 and which the Assessment Sub-Committee had considered on the 18th December 2008.

Whilst she may have been frustrated over the issue of the double white lines and wanting it to be re-addressed, and this again could be offered in mitigation, I nevertheless consider that, by her remark, Mrs Wyatt did fail to treat the Clerk with respect. As indicated elsewhere in this report, Mrs Wyatt has expressed her regret for her words on that occasion.

6. Findings

6.1 My findings in respect of the complaints submitted by the Clerk on 23rd November 2008 are that Councillor Mrs Wyatt:

- failed to treat the Clerk with respect in breach of Paragraph 3(1) of the Parish Council's Code of Conduct for members;
- bullied the Clerk in breach of Paragraph 3(2)(b) of the Code;
- disclosed confidential information relating to a part of the Clerk's terms and conditions of employment in breach of Paragraph 4 (a) of the Code of Conduct;
- did not do anything or attempt to do anything with the intention of seeking to compromise the impartiality of the Clerk in breach of Paragraph 3(2)(d) of the Code;
- did not use her position as a councillor improperly to confer on or secure for herself or any other person an advantage or a disadvantage; and
- did not fail to declare a personal interest as a member of Rugby in Plume at a meeting on 11th November 2008 and had no need to declare a prejudicial interest or leave the meeting on the same occasion by reason of the Code of Conduct.

My reasons for these findings are outlined in detail in sub-paragraphs 5.1 to 5.12 above.
6.2 My finding in respect of the complaint submitted by the Clerk on 12th February 2009 is that, for the reasons outlined in detail at sub-paragraph 5.13 above, Mrs Wyatt did fail to treat the Clerk with respect at a meeting of the Parish Council on 13th January 2009 in breach of Paragraph 3(1) of the Code of Conduct.

Kevin J Douglas

Independent Investigator

10th August 2010
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Attention: Carol Bradford
Monitoring Officer
Standards Board Sub-Committee
RBC
PO Box 16
Town Hall
Rugby
CV21 2LA

23rd November 2008

Dear Mrs Bradford,

Re: Complaints against Councillor Mrs Patricia Wyatt of Long Lawford Parish Council under the Code of Conduct

1. Being in breach of the code of conduct under Chapter 2, paragraph 3(1) “Treating Others with Respect” as follows:

   Over a period of approximately 6 months, as Clerk I have been systematically and relentlessly been subjected to unreasonable and excessive personal attack in that I have been publicly criticized, disrespected, and my integrity is constantly being questioned, the tone in many of Cllr. Mrs Wyatt's e-mails have been rude and discourteous.

2. Being in breach of the code of conduct under Chapter 2, paragraph 3(2)(b) and 3(2)(c) “Bullying and Intimidation” as follows:

   With reference to complaint 1 above and in addition, Cllr. Mrs Wyatt has attempted to undermine me and intimidate me which is detrimental to my confidence and capability and is adversely affecting my health. As an Officer of the Council, I am being personally criticised in an offensive manner.

3. Being in breach of the code of conduct under Chapter 2, paragraph 3(2)(d) “Compromising the impartiality of Officers of the authority” as follows:

   Cllr. Mrs Wyatt is also a member of Rugby In Plume and has a close association and professional relationship with Mrs Lilian Pallikaropoulos who has attended
several Parish Council meetings. There have been several instances when Minutes have been produced from meetings where discussions have taken place regarding Rugby Cement and Planning Applications, Mrs Pallikaropoulos has on a couple of occasions caused disruptions to meetings. Those disruptions have been minuted and then subsequently challenged by Mrs Pallikaropoulos and Cllr. Mrs Wyatt. This may have been in order to discriminate against Cemex, in favour of Mrs Pallikaropoulos and them both being a member of Rugby in Plume. In addition, Cllr. Mrs Wyatt has on several occasions challenged the accuracy of the Minutes, and tried to discuss approved Minutes of previous months meetings and has attempted to compromise my impartiality as Clerk to the Council by putting pressure on me to carry out my duties in a biased way.

4. **Being in breach of the Code of Conduct under Chapter 2, paragraph 4(a) “Disclosing Confidential Information”**.

At the Parish Council meeting of 14th October 2008, Cllr. Mrs Wyatt questioned publicly why the Parish Council was paying the Clerk £23.50 per month for provision of Broadband. Cllr. Mrs Wyatt was reminded that this was a confidential matter and one which should not be discussed in public. Cllr. Mrs Wyatt replied that she had mentioned it on previous occasions.

5. **Being in breach of the Code of Conduct under Chapter 2, paragraph 6(a) “You must not use, or attempt to use, your position improperly to the advantage or disadvantage of yourself or anyone else”**. As follows:

At the Parish Council meeting of 14th October 2008, when a Rugby Cement planning application was discussed and notes were produced and circulated by one Councillor with his opinions contained therein, it was voted to agree with the contents but that the notes would be circulated for other Councillors to add comments before a final official response was voted on and submitted as observations to the planning application. Following the meeting, Cllr. Mrs Wyatt scanned the document and sent it to Mrs Lilian Pallikaropoulos from Rugby in Plume (of which Cllr. Mrs Wyatt is a member) who subsequently sent it to the Editor of the Newspaper as Long Lawford’s response to the planning application.

6. **Being in breach of the Code of Conduct under Chapter 3, paragraph Personal and Prejudicial Interests as follows**:

At its Parish Council meeting of 11th November 2008, when a Cemex Climafuel Manufacturing Plant Planning Application was on the Agenda for discussion, Cllr. Mrs Wyatt failed to declare a personal and prejudicial interest in the Cemex planning application, being a member of Rugby in Plume – who are publicly against Cemex and the aforementioned planning application. Cllr. Mrs Wyatt failed to leave the meeting when the application was discussed on the agenda and proposed the objections to be submitted to the planning application.
I await your reply, at your convenience.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

Miss E. P. Groves
Clerk to Long Lawford & Little Lawford Parish Council
LONG LAWFORD PARISH COUNCIL
Miss D P Groves, Clerk
17 Edinburgh Way, Long Lawford
Rugby, CV23 9AE
Tel : 01788 575 258

Attention: Mrs Carol Bradford
Monitoring Officer
Standards Board Sub-Committee
Rugby Borough Council
PO Box 16
Town Hall
Rugby
CV21 2LA

12th February 2009

Dear Mrs Bradford,

Re: Complaints against Councillor Mrs Patricia Wyatt of Long Lawford Parish Council under the Code of Conduct

1. Being in Breach of the Code of Conduct under Chapter 1 (Respect for others) and Chapter 2, paragraph 3(1), paragraph 3(2)(a) (b) (c) and (d) as follows:

At the Parish Council meeting of 13th January 2009, correct procedure was not being followed by Councillor Mrs Wyatt when declaring interests, this caused some confusion, the Clerk advised of the correct procedure at which point Councillor Mrs Wyatt questioned the information given, corrected the Clerk on procedure, informed that correct procedure had been followed by herself and commented that she knew what the procedure was. This was done in a disrespectful offensive hostile intimidating and malicious manner which I believe occurred as a result of Councillor Mrs Wyatt being aware of a Code of Conduct complaint having been made against her by myself and amounts to victimisation. Advice was not followed and therefore the Minutes of 13th January 2009 are not clear with reference to Councillor Mrs Wyatt’s declaration of interests.

2. Being in Breach of the Code of Conduct under Chapter 1 (Respect for others, leadership, honesty and integrity, selflessness), Chapter 2, paragraph 3(1), 3(2)(a) (b) (c), Chapter 2, 6(a), Chapter 3 as follows:

a) At the Parish Council meeting of 9th December, Councillor Mrs Wyatt requested that an Agenda Item be placed on the Agenda for 13th January 09 (this
had originally been an Agenda item on an extraordinary meeting held on 7th August 2007 (page 326 at 07-08/03, point j), minutes enclosed) and was proposed by Councillor Mrs Wyatt to put forward to the Highway Maintenance and Safety Team at WCC – The provision of Double White lines, stopping just before the junction of Lawford Heath Lane crossing to Livingstone Avenue entrance, eliminating the need for people from overtaking and hampering people/residents turning right into Livingstone Avenue. The item was placed on the Agenda for 13th January 09, as requested. Councillor Mrs Wyatt asked what had happened to the request made and why it hadn’t been re-addressed. The Clerk explained the reply given by WCC as to why the idea was not going to be implemented. Councillor Mrs Wyatt stated that the issue should be re-addressed at which point the Chairman asked Mrs Wyatt what she was proposing the reply given was “I am proposing that the issue of double white lines on the A428 into Livingstone Avenue be re-addressed or does the Clerk rule what this Parish Council does”?

Councillor Mrs Wyatt did not declare a prejudicial interest in the item – being a member of Livingstone Avenue Residents Association and herself being a resident of Livingstone Avenue.

b) At the joint meeting of Warwickshire County Council and Warwickshire Association of Local Councils – Rugby Area Committee held on Thursday 29th November 2007, Councillor Mrs Wyatt raised the same issue of painting double white lines on the A428 right hand turn into Livingstone Avenue, using her position improperly having a personal and a prejudicial interest in the matter. (See Minutes of meeting enclosed, last paragraph point 5 on page 3).

c) See also e-mail dated 19.08.07 from Councillor Mrs Wyatt send to rugbyoffice@warwickshire.gov.uk, and Clr. Timms@warwickshire.gov.uk, using her position improperly having a personal and a prejudicial interest in the matter referred to above.

3. Being in breach of the Code of Conduct under Chapter 1 (Respect for others), Chapter 2, paragraph 3(1), 3(2)(a), paragraph 3(2)(b) paragraph 3(2)(c) and paragraph 3(2)(d) as follows:

At the Parish Council meeting of 13th January 2009, Councillor Mrs Wyatt complained that she had requested that Dog Signs be placed on the Agenda for January 13th and that this had not been done. It was pointed out to Councillor Mrs Wyatt that the item was on the Agenda at item 9e).

At the Parish Council meeting of 13th January 2009, Councillor Mrs Wyatt complained she had requested that Double White Lines on the A428 had been requested to be placed on the Agenda for January and that this had not been done. It was pointed out to Councillor Mrs Wyatt that the item was on the Agenda at item 9j).
4. **Being in breach of the Code of Conduct under Chapter 1 (Respect for others), Chapter 2, paragraph 3(1), paragraph 3(2)(a), paragraph 3(2)(b) and (c), paragraph 3(2)(d) and paragraph 7 as follows:**

Councillor Mrs Wyatt failed to agree to submit a declaration of interest form as requested in the Minutes of 13th January 2009 – see Minute 09/01/13, dismissed and challenged the Clerk’s advice and questioned publicly the Clerk’s integrity which is detrimental to my confidence and capability as Clerk and which has adversely affected my health. The Chairman confirmed to Mrs Wyatt what was being requested of her when the comment was made by Councillor Mrs Wyatt that she would first speak with the Monitoring Officer at RBC.

I await to hear from you.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

Miss D P Groves  
Clerk to Long Lawford & Little Lawford Parish Council

Encs: Approved Minutes dated 13 January 09  
Copy of Approved Minutes dated 7th August 2007  
Copy e-mail dated 19th August 2007 from Cllr. Mrs Wyatt to RugbyOffice and Cllr. Timms at WCC  
Copy Minutes of joint meeting of WCC and WALC and RAC 29th November 2007
LONG LAWFORD & LITTLE LAWFORD PARISH COUNCIL

Declaration of Acceptance of Office

PATRICIA WYATT

I ………………………………………………. having been elected to the office of Chairman / Councillor for the Parish of Long Lawford and Little Lawford declare that I take the office upon myself and will duly and faithfully fulfil the duties of it according to the best of my judgement and ability.

I undertake to observe the code as to the conduct, which is expected of members of the council of the Parish of Long Lawford and Little Lawford.

9th May 2006 Signed: ………………………………

This declaration was made and signed before me

Signed: ………………………………

Proper Officer / Member of the Council of the Parish of Long Lawford and Little Lawford.
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LONG LAWFORD PARISH COUNCIL
Miss D P Groves, Clerk
17 Edinburgh Way, Long Lawford
Rugby, CV23 9AE
Tel: 01788 575 258

Attention: Carol Bradford
Monitoring Officer
Standards Board Sub-Committee
RBC
PO Box 16
Town Hall
Rugby
CV21 2LA

5th December 2008

Dear Mrs Bradford,

Re: CC08/004

Thank you for your letter dated 3rd December with reference to the above. I accept your letter as acknowledgement of receipt of my complaint as formal notice to me as Clerk.

Please find below and enclosed information requested:


2. Copy of Minutes of Parish Council meeting held on 11th November 2008 (due to be approved on 9th December 2008). Should you require an approved copy, please do not hesitate to let me know.

3. Copies of emails/correspondence from Cllr. Mrs Wyatt which I consider to be rude, discourteous, bullying and intimidating referenced as Document Numbers and enclosed herewith.

   Documents 4a) and 4d)
   Documents 6a) – Capital letters suggests rude tone and shouting
   Document 6 b) – Capital letters suggests rude tone and shouting
   Document 6 d) – Capital letters suggest rude tone and shouting
   Document 11

At Parish Council meetings, referring to myself as “she” after being requested to use my name/title correctly by another Parish Councillor.

InfoReqStandComReMrsWyattNov08ComplaitCOC/procedures/CodeofConduct
4. Examples of occasions when I consider that Mrs Wyatt has attempted to undermine, intimidate and bully me:

A) Consistently and sometimes unlawfully challenging the accuracy of Minutes in an attempt to undermine me and challenge my integrity and professionalism. Checking that I am doing my job by publicly and challengingly questioning if I have carried out my duties. I use the SLCC Clerk’s guide to procedures etc. extensively. At Parish Council meetings, I have been on a number of occasions asked to go back and check a point I have made or to check information I have given to Council with WALC which questions my ability to perform my duties, is critical and disrespectful. Questioning my integrity (see Document Nos. 4a), 11, 13, Minutes of meeting 8th July 2008 ref: 08-07/05, 08-07/12, Minutes of meeting 9th September 2008 ref: 08-09/05, 08-09/06, 08-09/08, Minutes of meeting 14th October 2008 ref: 08-10/07, 08-10/08 (see also document No. 8 and Cllr. Mrs Wyatt’s name on the list when I sent the Agora space Noise Assessment on 11th July 08), Minutes of meeting 11th November 2008 ref: 08/11/05, 08-11/06, 08-11/09 point e).

B) I refer to document no. 1a) and 1b) in which it is inferred by the contents that I as Parish Clerk have refused to let Councillor Mrs Pat Wyatt see/have a copy of the Cemex Climafuel Planning Application for Southam. Mrs Lillian Pallikarouposoulos can only have gained the information contained therein from Councillor Mrs Pat Wyatt.

C) I refer to document nos. 7a), 7b) and 7c) in July 2007 Councillor Mrs Pat Wyatt having asked for arrangements to be made to view the Parish Council Accounts, I subsequently arranged the use of the upstairs meeting room of the Memorial Hall for such purpose, I then did not receive a reply to my email (7c) nor did I receive a telephone call. Councillor Mrs Pat Wyatt did not arrange to come and view the accounts.

D) I refer to document nos. 14, 15, 16a) and b), 6a), 6b), 6c) and 6d).
On 3rd June 2008, I posted the notice of appointment of date for the exercise of electors’ rights to inspect the accounts for the year ended 31 March 2008. As my hours of work are 15 per week, I allowed for 3 hours per day from a Tuesday to a Friday from 17th June through to 16th July to allow members of the public to inspect the accounts. (Throughout the year the Finance Sub-Committee had in total met 6 times where all receipts and bank statements were checked. In addition, bank reconciliations were carried out and agreed by the Finance sub-committee each quarter. The bank reconciliation and confirmation that all accounts were in order was subsequently placed on the full Council Agenda each quarter with a recommendation that they be approved, and were approved, by full Council. The bank reconciliations/accounts were approved each quarter by all Councillors. Councillor Mrs Pat Wyatt had been elected onto the Finance sub-committee and had not attended a single meeting, sending apologies once). On page 380
of the Minutes of 13th May 2008 (doc No. 15) the end of year accounts (including income and expenditure for the whole financial year and which had been circulated to all Councillors before the end of April 08) were approved by ALL Councillors subject to Internal Audit and Completion. In the Minutes of 10th June 2008 (enclosed) and at 08-06/09 the internal audited accounts were approved by ALL Councillors.

On 15th July at 18.45pm and up to 10.43pm I received several e-mails (see docs. 16a) 16b) 6a), 6d) from Councillor Mrs Wyatt informing that she was having problems with her internet provider and that she had sent emails requesting a viewing appointment for the Long Lawford Parish Accounts, she went on to say that the problems had prevented her sending e-mails or receiving them from 11th July 08. In between receiving the emails on the 15th July, I received a telephone call from Councillor Mrs Wyatt whereby I was informed quote “I want to see the accounts BEFORE you send them to the external auditors, tomorrow 16th July at the Memorial Hall at 12 noon. I explained that this was not possible as I had not been given sufficient “reasonable” notice as stated on the notice of appointment displayed on the notice board but mainly due to the fact that the Parish Council had been chosen to undergo an extended audit, and that there was a huge amount of paperwork that I was in the middle of sorting out as I had a deadline to submit documentation by the 21st July. At which point Councillor Mrs Wyatt began to shout at me down the telephone and demand that she be allowed to view the accounts. I explained that I was not about to get into an argument with her about it and suggested that if she wanted to complain she should speak with the Chairman. An email was then sent to Chairman Councillor Mr David Draper on the 16th July (see doc 6b) and a reply forwarded to Councillor Mrs Wyatt from the Chairman (see doc 6c). As you will note Councillor Mrs Wyatt was offered the opportunity to view the accounts the following week where it was suggested that Councillor Mrs Wyatt telephone me to arrange a convenient time. Following on from this, as at C) above, I heard nothing more from Councillor Mrs Wyatt and did not receive any telephone call or any further request to view the accounts until I advertised the closure of audit on the notice board where members of the public are allowed to view the “External Auditors Statement of Accounts” which had been approved (see docs 5a) and 5b). I arranged an appointment with Councillor Mrs Wyatt for Wednesday 17th September and requested that Councillor Mrs Erica Clark attend with me. Councillor Mrs Wyatt upon being shown the External Auditors Statement of Accounts commented quote “I don’t want to see these documents; I want to see the Long Lawford Parish Council Accounts”. I informed that this appointment was to view the External Auditors Statement of Accounts only, as had been advertised on the Notice Board.

E) See Doc. No. 9 - Notice Board Item Request.
Once again in an endeavour to comply with a request made by Councillor Mrs Wyatt I received no reply to my e-mail.
F) See Doc. No. 10a, 10b, 10c, 10d) and 10e) 
At two Parish Council meetings since, July and September, Councillor Mrs Wyatt has publicly accused me of not placing items on the Agenda, as requested by herself. The documents referred to above refer to the only request I have ever received from Councillor Mrs Wyatt for items to be placed on the Agenda and you will note my response to the request.

G) See Doc. No 12
This is the only time when a Finance committee meeting has been called at such short notice. I received no reply from Councillor Mrs Wyatt to my email.

5. Documentary evidence of Cllr Mrs Wyatt’s challenges to the accuracy of the minutes and her putting pressure (indirect) on me to carry out my duties in a biased way.

Please see doc. Nos. 4a), 11, 13 and Minutes dated 11th November 08, 14th October 08, 9th September 08 and 8th July 08. There is a pattern of behaviour from Councillor Mrs Wyatt which I believe shows that there is complete loyalty shown to Mrs Lillian Pallikaropoulos and Rugby in Plume regardless of the true facts as they have taken place and evidenced by approval of minutes by the other Long Lawford Parish Councillors. There is a menacing way in which Councillor Mrs Wyatt is constantly challenging my integrity and attempting to distort the truth in a biased way in favour of Mrs Pallikaropoulos and/or Rugby in Plume. This certainly feels like pressure on me to cease recording the true facts in an unbiased way.

6. Evidence that Councillor Mrs Wyatt passed the notes referred to in complaint No. 5 to a member of the public. Please see doc. Nos. 2a), 2b) and 2c) and doc. No. 3.

I apologise for the length of this letter and for the many enclosures. However, I do think it is important to include all of the evidence as I believe this will more accurately show the extent to which the complaints I am making against Councillor Mrs Wyatt exist.

I wait to hear from you further.

Yours sincerely,

Miss D P Groves
Clerk to Long Lawford & Little Lawford Parish Council

InfoReqStandComReMrsWyattNov08ComplaintCOC/procedures/CodeofConduct
### MINUTES OF THE LONG LAWFORD PARISH COUNCIL MEETING HELD ON TUESDAY 11th November 2008 IN THE MEMORIAL HALL, RAILWAY STREET, LONG LAWFORD

**Present:**
- Cllr. Mr K Rye (KR)
- Miss D Groves (DG)
- Cllr. Mr M Davison (MD)
- Cllr. Mrs E Clark (EC)
- County Cllr. Mr D Hodkinson (DH)
- Cllr. Mr R Cleton (RC)
- Cllr. Mrs P Wyatt (PW)
- Cllr. Mrs C. Watson (CW)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minute</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **08-11/01** | Opening of Meeting and Apologies for Absence  
Chairman Cllr. Mr Rye welcomed everyone and opened the meeting at 7.35pm. Cllr. Mrs Lock apologised for absence due to being away from the area, Cllr. Mr Conroy-Hargreaves apologised and was unable to attend due to illness and Cllr. Mrs Slack apologised for absence due to being away on holiday. Cllr. Mrs Watson sent apologies for arriving late at 7.50pm. |
| **08-11/02** | To Receive Police Report  
PCSO Simon Thomas circulated the Incident Report. It was noted that incidents had considerably reduced compared to a similar period last year. Incidents in the current report included the small but usual rise at this time of year due to Halloween and Bonfire Night. It was reported that there was now more numbers of PCSO, s present who were targeting anti-social behaviour and that this was having an effect. |
| **08/11/03** | To Invite Members of the Public to Speak on Matters of Concern  
The Chairman informed that this was the opportunity for members of the public to speak and confirmed that in accordance with the Parish Council's standing orders, this would be for 30 mins. in total, allowing for 2 minutes per person, time permitting and depending on the complexity of the issue. If further discussion was necessary the Chairman could suspend standing orders or have the item added to a future agenda.  
There was an enquiry about Back Lane and the lack of sufficient lighting columns, it was reported that the developers of Back Lane would be putting lights at the entrance to Tee Tong Road. This was still thought to be insufficient.  
A further enquiry was made about the lack of space for buses passing each other on Back Lane. This was reported to be a County Council issue and it was suggested that a letter be written to Roger Newham from the Economy and Environment Dept at WCC. It was further noted that whatever the outcome at the Sheaf and Sickle junction there was an intention to pull back the curve a little. This was still thought to leave insufficient room for buses to pass. The Clerk was asked to raise the issue.  
Dog Signs were requested to be put up in the Village. Cllr. Mrs Wyatt and Cllr. Mr Cleton pointed out that the Parish Council had previously provided and erected dog signs. The Clerk informed that this was a Borough Council responsibility and would check with the Borough Council. |
| **08/11/04** | To Receive Declarations of Personal, Prejudicial or Other Interest  
Cllr. Mrs Wyatt declared a personal interest in item 8.A.k)  
Cllr. Mrs Wyatt declared a personal interest in Boughton Leigh Charities, if discussed  
Cllr. Mrs Wyatt declared a personal interest in Rugby in Plume if discussed at item 8.A.e) |
| **08/11/05** | To Approve the Minutes of the Meeting held on Tuesday 14th October 2008  
Re: R410/08CM038 – Cllr. Mrs Wyatt commented that after Councillors had responded to Cllr. Mr Davison’s comments and the vote and resolution was made the rest of what had been reported in the Minutes did not transpire within the meeting. Cllr. Mr Davison questioned which part didn’t transpire. Cllr. Mrs Wyatt replied that a response was going to be made and that there was no other comment. Chairman Cllr. Rye commented that a request had been made for a copy to be circulated for inclusion of comments by other Councillors. Cllr. Mr Davison had circulated a draft copy and sent it to all Councillors where comments from other Councillors were to be added to the |
draft and brought back to the meeting. There had been comments and a response received which was due to be discussed later on the Agenda and for the question of accuracy additional comments must be voted on or the Council would be in breach of policy/procedure.

Cllr. Mrs Watson commented that she was under the impression that the observations were to be sent directly to the WCC after circulation of the draft by Cllr. Mr Davison and not brought back to the Council for approval.

It was proposed by Cllr. Mrs Wyatt that this Minute was inaccurate, seconded by Cllr. Mrs Watson 2 voted in favour, 4 voted against.

Cllr. Mrs Watson wanted clarification that under standing orders there was a quorum present at the start of the current meeting to convene the meeting. It was confirmed by the Clerk that the meeting was in quorate at 5 members and did not need 7 members as Cllr. Mrs Watson had believed to be the case.

At item 08/10/10 Cllr. Mrs Watson also asked for clarification that where an item on the agenda is confidential, the minutes of that item should be kept separate from the standard minutes. The Clerk informed that as the confidential item had not been discussed, there was no need to record it separately. The Clerk was asked to seek advice and clarify the matter. Post Meeting Note: Please be informed that advice has been sought on the matter and the procedure followed by the Clerk was correct.

At item 08/10/08 Cllr. Mrs Clark informed that the sentence should read: "letter be sent by the Parish Council"...and not "letter be sent to the Parish Council".... Proposed by Cllr. Mrs Clark, seconded by Cllr. Mr Davison and agreed by all.

It was proposed by Cllr. Mrs Clark, seconded by Cllr. Mr Davison and agreed by all to accept the Minutes with the one agreed amendment at item 08/10/08.

To Receive Progress Reports on Outstanding Items Not Covered Later on the Agenda

Cllr. Mrs Wyatt enquired whether a letter had been sent by the Clerk to the Solicitors acting for Sunrisre regarding the Pigeons. The Clerk confirmed that the letter had been sent.

Cllr. Mrs Wyatt enquired whether a letter had been sent by the Clerk to Miss Thomas. The Clerk confirmed that the letter had been sent.

Cllr. Mrs Wyatt enquired whether the problem regarding the St. Lights in Ashman Ave/Round Ave had been resolved. The Clerk informed that the problem had been resolved and at no cost to the Council.

Cllr. Mrs Wyatt pointed out that it had been noted at 08/10/09 of the Minutes of 14th October that it was advisable to get the responses to the Climafuel Planning Application into WCC as soon as possible. The Clerk informed that she had spoken with WCC and had been advised that there was plenty of time to submit responses and that it would be unlikely that the planning application would be going before the Committee before January 09.

Cllr. Mrs Wyatt wanted to discuss the Freedom of Information Act. It was pointed out that this item was on the Agenda for discussion.

Cllr. Mrs Wyatt requested a copy of a letter agreed by Council at its meeting on 14th October 08 and sent to Cllr. Hodkinson regarding footpath schemes in Back Lane and Silton Lane.

Cllr. Mrs Wyatt corrected an error in her postcode and pointed out that it should read 9BU and not 9ST.

Cllr. Mrs Wyatt enquired whether there had been reports received about the footpath in School St. None had been received. Cllr. Mr Rye offered to take a look at the area.

Cllr. Mrs Wyatt enquired whether the spare light bulbs had been collected from a former Councillor. Cllr. Mrs Wyatt was reminded that the Councillor responsible for Lighting was still ill, therefore nothing had yet been done about this.

08-11/07 To Receive Borough/County Council Reports

The following report was received and read to Council by Cllr. Mrs Watson:

We have had a busy month of meetings and training seminars that have included:

Warwickshire Waste Partnership day, where the future of Rugby’s recycling was discussed and is on schedule to start in April 2009. Each household will receive an extra
wheelie bin to use instead of the red boxes, making 3 in total. An advertising campaign is being prepared with leaflets and presentations to ensure the public are fully informed before the changes commence.

A drop in session giving recycling information is planned for Tuesday 25th November between 5 – 6.30pm in the Memorial Hall, Long Lawford.

A new contract has been secured with Pure Recycling Ltd who will process Rugby’s recyclable materials such as glass, plastic bottles, paper, cardboard, foil, cans and cartons. This eco friendly plant at Eftington, near Stratford Warwickshire will have solar panels, ground source heat and rain water collection and will be the best in the country. It will provide a bridge over the works so that visitors, especially school children, can learn what happens to their recyclable items. They will even provide the transport for the schools! There was some negative press regarding the location of the site and we were advised that recyclable items will be delivered there once sorted and compressed and is far closer than the arrangements presently in place.

A new scrutiny panel has been formed reviewing highway drainage problems in the Borough and we will make sure that they are aware of the hot spots in this ward.

Another panel has been formed to review engagement with young people and we both have been appointed to this panel.

A Warwickshire Compact event was held promoting the works of the voluntary and community sector and celebrating the success of diverse voluntary groups that are only able to carry out their work with the help of volunteers and various funding including service level agreements from the Borough Council.

ASB meetings are still regularly held with relevant Council officers and the Police to try and improve the area around Holbrook Road shops and the footpath leading to Boyce Way and the pavilion and car park areas in King George’s field.

Cllrs. Claire Watson and Sally Bragg

The following report was received and discussed by County Cllr. Mr Hockinson:


I have met as promised the Engineers involved both with the traffic light proposals and the Engineer involved with design of the two footpath routes (below). They reported to me on the results of the informal consultation that closed 2 months ago. There was no single dominant view expressed; 7 were broadly in favour of the traffic signaled junction and 10 were broadly opposed. Within each there was a wide variety of points emphasized including, for instance, waiting to decide until the Western Relief Road was in operation. I can provide fuller information after the meeting if there is a clear demand for it.

We looked at the delayed timetable for the Western Relief Road and had to conclude that there was no window of opportunity remaining for waiting to decide until then: the first S106 agreement is out of time in March 2010.

You will all clearly recall your own opposition to traffic lights. Also, I found the County’s Engineers warning that a Traffic Lights scheme might, in my language, more rearrange than actually solve problems at the junction, because of their complexity. We concluded that the idea of a Puffin Crossing suggested by you should now be explored. The Signals Engineers have since confirmed to me the feasibility of a Puffin Crossing between the junction and the bus stop opposite 1-
27 Rugby Road.

The next steps:

(1) The Engineers will seek the relevant Builders' consent to changing the Legal Agreements between them and WCC so as to switch money given long ago for Traffic Lights to a Puffin Crossing.
(2) There will then be an informal consultation with Parish Council and residents like the recent one on Traffic Lights.
(3) If there is a reasonable degree of consensus on (2) there will then be a formal consultation on fully detailed proposals. At that point a go ahead to construction could be given if no objections are raised.

As I recently mentioned to your Chairman, I have gone to the extent of doing a newsletter to those households previously consulted on the now defunct Traffic Lights proposals, to keep them fully informed of recent developments.

For your information, two final points:

(1) The Puffin Crossing would be effectively identical in nature to the two that I have recently secured a start on site for on Lawford Road, New Bilton. Both are located on the far side of the notorious Addison Road roundabout.
(2) The Puffin Crossing scheme will contain a footpath link to the recently constructed bus stop arrangements on the south side of Rugby Road. I have also ensured that there will be a certain amount of footpath provision at the Sheaf and Sickle, right at the junction and back some way along Bilton Lane. This is to provide safer access by users of the Puffin Crossing than otherwise.

2. Back Lane and Bilton Lane footpath schemes.
Fresh consideration will need to be given to these as soon as the Builders have agreed to vary the S106 agreement (above). It remains my wish to have a complete set of proposals for the Puffin Crossing and the two footpaths published for consultation in a single exercise. This is so that all nearby residents may be visibly assured that all proposals are on the table at the same time and they are not getting just part of the story.

A general discussion took place on the above report. Cllr. Mr Rye requested a copy of the newsletter sent to residents referred to above.
Cllr. Mrs Wyatt wanted clarification on the footpath and side of Back Lane leading up to the School. Cllr. Mr Hodkinson replied that the issue of which side of Back Lane, needs to be considered further and depends on whether there is to be traffic lights or a puffin crossing. Sensible solutions will be looked at later. Cllr. Mrs Wyatt wanted assurance that there will be a footpath to walk on in Bilton Lane. Cllr. Mr Hodkinson informed that he understands there is a proposal for a footpath which would run to the Bear public house but as to any details, he has no idea at present.
Cllr. Mr Hodkinson, having recently becoming aware of 106 money earmarked for the purpose of a Cycle Route, informed that detailed design plans or drawings are not yet available.

CCllr. DH

08/11/08
To Consider the exclusion of the public and press for consideration of confidential items
None.

08/11/09
To Receive Reports from Sub-Committees
A. Finance & Administration Panel/Clerk
a) The making and enforcement of Byelaws – Cllr. Mr Rye confirmed that a favourable response, as agreed, was submitted. Cllr. Mrs Wyatt requested a copy of what had been submitted. Cllr. Mr Rye informed that it had been a “tick box” reply on the internet. He would endeavour to obtain a copy of what had been sent.

b) Core Strategy Consultation – Cllr. Mr Rye informed that this item would have to be placed for discussion on next month’s agenda due to pressure of other items, trouble with e-mails etc. Cllr. Mrs Watson informed that it would be too late by then and that there was no response to made, the question would need to be asked if late responses could be submitted. Cllr. Mr Hockinsson informed that personal responses were allowed to be made should anyone wish. Cllr. Mr Rye invited Councillors to make individual responses.

c) To Consider Freedom of Information Act – Cllr. Mr Davison informed that this document had been looked at and required a form to be filled out in listing what information is held by the Parish Council and how it can be accessed. To be looked at further. Cllr. Mrs Watson was given a copy of the document. Cllr. Mrs Wyatt registered disapproval of charges which could be £10 in some cases. Cllr. Mrs Watson informed that there was guidance on charges from WALC. Cllr. Mrs Watson also informed that retaining certain data makes it necessary to register with the Commission for data protection for which there is a charge. The Clerk confirmed that no notification from WALC had been received regarding this. It was suggested that the Monitoring Officer at RBC be contacted for further guidance.

d) To Consider Standing Orders point 4 Interests – Cllr. Mr Rye informed that following a meeting with the Monitoring Officer at RBC, the following had been advised:

i. Standing Orders should include a policy on the availability of Minutes stating where copies can be obtained from and how much would be charged. 10p per printed side should be levied.

Cllr. Mrs Watson enquired where copies could be obtained from; it was confirmed that the Clerk would provide copies.

It was proposed that this be accepted by Cllr. Mrs Clark, seconded by Cllr. Mrs Watson. 5 votes for, Cllr. Mr Cleton voted against.

ii. A Standing Order be added; Parish Councillor reports (if any) to be circulated by Councillors to other Councillors prior to Parish meetings.

It was proposed that this be accepted by Cllr. Mr Cleton, seconded by Cllr. Mrs Clark, all were in favour.

iii. Standing Order Point 4 to read: If any Member has any Personal or Prejudicial interest, within the meaning of the Code of Conduct, Chapter 3, to include paragraph 12(2) in any contract, proposed contract or other matter on any monthly agenda item listed, that Member will declare the interest, state the reference no. of the item listed on the agenda for the month and give the reason for the interest. The Clerk will record particulars of any interest declared by a Member and the record will be open at reasonable hours for inspection by any Member.

It was proposed that this be accepted by Cllr. Mr Cleton, seconded by Cllr. Mr Davison, all were in favour.

Cllr. Mr Rye requested that the Clerk implement the Changes to the Standing Orders and circulate a copy to all Councillors.

e) Approval of Observations for Planning Application No. R410/08/CM038 and S955/08/CM033 – Cllr. Mr Rye commented that a draft response had been circulated to all Cllrs. Inviting comments to be added. He enquired if anyone else wished to add comments. No comments were made. The Clerk read out the draft response in full. Cllr. Mrs Wyatt noted that grammatical errors were present in the draft form circulated by Cllr. Mr Davison. It was confirmed that these had been amended by Cllr. Mrs Watson. It was proposed by Cllr. Mrs Wyatt, seconded by Cllr. Mrs Clark and agreed by all to submit the observations as contained in 651/12/08 and read out by the Clerk. A copy of the observations to be sent to CCllr. Mr Hodkinson.
Cllr. Mrs Wyatt confirmed that she had had the Climafuel, Malpass Farm application documentation to view for a while but as Cllr. Mrs Watson had now finished with the files, requested to retain the documentation files. Cllr. Mr Rye commented that they should be kept with the Clerk. Cllr. Mrs Watson enquired whether the Parish Council had received a copy of the Southam Climafuel Application. The Clerk confirmed that she had not received a copy of the Southam Climafuel application. Cllr. Mrs Wyatt requested that the Clerk mince the fact that the Clerk was confirming that she had not received a copy of the Southam Climafuel application. The Clerk confirmed that this would be minuted. Cllr. Mrs Wyatt reported having difficulties obtaining the Southam Climafuel Planning application. Cllr. Mr Rye suggested the matter be taken up with the Planning Department at the Borough Council.

f) Rugby Economic Prosperity Strategy 2009/10 – Cllr. Mrs Watson offered to make enquiries if there is background documentation available as none received by Clerk.

g) To Consider the Purchase of Flower Bulbs – Due to the fact that purchase of flower bulbs had not been budgeted for, it was proposed by Cllr. Mrs Watson, seconded by Cllr. Mrs Wyatt and agreed by all that £50 would be budgeted for next year for the purchase of flower bulbs and that the gardening club would be asked to do the planting.

h) To Consider Hedge Cutting by Church in Chapel Street – This hedge is overhanging parking spaces, opposite the Church which is owned by Severn Trent. The Clerk was asked to contact Severn Trent to ask them to deal with the hedge.

i) Staggered Gate Letter to Residents of Boyce Way – The Anti-Social Behaviour Committee have sent a letter to the residents asking for comments to suggestions put forward to help alleviate anti-social behaviour in the area. Suggestions include a staggered gate to prevent motorbikes from using Boyce Way (this would not inhibit the use of wheelchairs/buggies etc.) and to do some planting to create a wild flower meadow on the grassed area around Greenwood Close and Boyce Way. Cllr. Mr Davison enquired who would be funding the project, part of the funding would come from Crime and Prevention and the Borough Council are looking at sites to improve with more greenery. Cllr. Mrs Watson is putting the idea forward. The Clerk requested a copy of the letter sent. Cllr. Mrs Watson to forward a copy.

j) PC Office and Computer – Cllr. Mrs Watson pointed out that it has been 18 months since the donation of the PC from WCC who should be informed what has been done with it. If PC is not going to use it, it should be donated to someone else. Thought needs to be given to the need for a PC office to qualify for Quality Status. Cllr. Mrs Wyatt pointed out that Dunchurch PC have opened an office and suggested inviting the Chairman to speak to LLPC about it. Cllr. Mr Davison asked who would run an office. Cllr. Mr Rye suggested gathering more. Cllr. Mrs Wyatt commented that a Parish Website would also be needed for Quality Status purposes. Cllr. Mrs Watson commented that the Council have the use of the upstairs room at the Memorial Hall to use as an office and have broadband installed. The Clerk pointed out that it was not legal, as informed by the Memorial Hall Trustees, to have a dedicated telephone line for the use of the Parish Council, Cllr. Mr Clifton confirmed this. Cllr. Mrs Watson felt that the PC needed to start looking for alternative premises.

k) Un-adopted Highways – Following discussion, it was noted that Un-adopted highways was not a Parish Council matter. Cllr. Mr Hodgkinson commented that he would be happy to receive comments to pass on. Cllr. Mrs Wyatt commented on communal drives to houses and information not being given to people when taking on properties. Cllr. Mr Hodgkinson commented that private problems with properties were not something that Councillors could get involved with or solve.

l) Lawford Heath Dog Park – The Clerk outlined a proposal received from WCC for Long Lawford Parish Council to take on the lease of this area for a rent in the region of £100 per annum or an offer for the Parish Council to purchase the land for a sum in
the region of £10,000. It was discussed, proposed by Cllr. Mrs Clark, seconded by Cllr. Mrs Wyatt and agreed by all to reject both offers. The Clerk was asked to inform WCC of the decision. Cllr. Mr Cleton asked what had happened to the discussion of purchasing the play area at Lawford Heath. The Clerk was requested to place the item back on the Agenda for December.

m) Communities in Control, Code of Conduct Consultation – Cllr. Mrs Watson took the paperwork and agreed to read the documentation, circulate a draft reply to all Councillors and requested that it be placed back on the Agenda for December. Post Meeting Note: Please could Cllr. Mrs Watson send a copy of draft to be circulated to the Clerk.

n) Insurance Claim – Accident dated 3.10.07 – The Clerk outlined the matter, Insurance Company have been informed. Matter is in hand.

B. Recreation Grounds

a) To Consider Hedge Cutting – Cllr. Mrs Watson informed that the King George’s hedge was straggly and that the Police had asked the Parish Council to look at cutting it back. Cllr. Mr Cleton agreed that the hedge needed topping. Cllr. Mrs Wyatt enquired whether the handyman could take on the task, it was decided that it was a skilled job and that the handyman could not do it. It was proposed by Cllr. Mrs Watson, seconded by Cllr. Mr Cleton and agreed by all to ask the Clerk to obtain a quote.

C. Play and Leisure Group

a) 106 Agreement Play Equipment Update – Cllrs. Mrs Watson informed that a meeting had taken place with RBC and relevant officers with Cllr. Mr Rye and the Clerk in attendance. By now the 2nd payment should have been received from the developers. It was confirmed that an independent noise assessment needs to be carried out. Cllr. Mrs Watson has contacted Noise assessor and plans to meet with him. RBC has requested that ESPO is used to obtain quotes. Playdale have responded by saying that the discount offered would be more than would be offered through ESPO. Options: purchase direct from Playdale, use ESPO to obtain quote from Playdale, use ESPO to obtain all quotes. Cllr. Mrs Watson to seek further guidance from 106 Officer at RBC. Cllr. Mrs Wyatt enquired how long it would take to do a noise assessment, this is not yet known. Cllr. Mrs Watson pointed out that it was still the choice of LLPC about which equipment is purchased.

b) To Consider Swing Replacement in King George’s Field – Cllr. Mrs Wyatt enquired whether this is the same swing taken down for Health and Safety reasons by the handyman. This was affirmed. Cllr. Mrs Watson enquired whether the swings were still under warranty – installed sometime in about 2003. Clerk was asked to check whether the warranty was still valid, if not quotes to be obtained. Proposed by Cllr. Mr Cleton, seconded by Cllr. Mrs Clark and agreed by all.

D. Transport, Highways, Drains and Street Lighting

a) St. Lighting Column Thomas Way – It was confirmed that a new column had now been installed.

b) St. Lighting Columns x 3 Bowls Lawford Heath – It was confirmed that the replacement bowls had been ordered.

c) Cllr. Mrs Watson reported trees overhanging from Sunrise. The trees needed cutting back. A name and telephone number has been obtained by Cllr. Mrs Watson of a relative of Sunrise who normally cuts back the trees.
d) Cllr. Mr Hodkinson informed of an agreement coming up to deal with minor highways improvements. He outlined a concern over a section of the A428 where the verge edge was corrupted. This was being watched. Cllr. Mrs Watson confirmed that talks were being had with WCC about the flooding at the Bridge in Church Lawford. Support was given to Cllr. Mr Hodkinson to pursue the problem with the aforementioned section of the A428 and the verge edge. Cllr. Mrs Wyatt informed that the drains at Back Lane had been reported. Cllr. Hodkinson asked for further information when he would then raise the problem.

08-11/10

12. To Receive Details of Financial Matters
a) To Receive and Approve Accounts for Payment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>CHQ NO.</th>
<th>ISSUED TO</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11.11.08</td>
<td>1661/2/3/4</td>
<td>Confidential</td>
<td>£1,205.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.11.08</td>
<td>1665</td>
<td>RBLegion Wreath</td>
<td>£25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.11.08</td>
<td>1666</td>
<td>Chairman Training</td>
<td>£75.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.11.08</td>
<td>1667</td>
<td>Petty Cash Vouchers 87-93</td>
<td>£101.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.11.08</td>
<td>1668</td>
<td>Telecoms Nov 08</td>
<td>£23.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.11.08</td>
<td>1669</td>
<td>HMRC Tax &amp; NI Due Nov 08</td>
<td>£203.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.11.08</td>
<td>1670</td>
<td>Line Marking Football Pitches x 2</td>
<td>£117.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.11.08</td>
<td>1671</td>
<td>Rospa Safety Inspection 12.10.08</td>
<td>£246.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Income October 2208

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.10.08</td>
<td>Cons. Dividend</td>
<td>£1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.10.08</td>
<td>VAT refund Roundabout Ryelands</td>
<td>£1,645.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bank Balance at 31st October 08 = £35,581.91

It was proposed by Cllr. Mrs Clark, seconded by Cllr. Mr Cleton to accept the accounts for payment. 5 voted in favour, Cllr. Mrs Wyatt abstained.

08-11/11

To Receive Details of Planning Matters

- R08/1597/WAI – Waiver of condition 3 of planning permission reference R07/1726/PLN to include a window in the ground and first floors of the proposed two storey extension. 141 Townsend Lane, Long Lawford

No Observations.

- R08/1680/HOUS – Erection of a two part storey, part first floor front extension of the existing garage to provide an additional bay. 3 Nene Court, Townsend Lane, Long Lawford

No Observations.

- R08/1689/PLN – Erection of a detached dwelling and associated works (resubmission) Land Adjoining 6 Chapel Street, Long Lawford

No Observations.

08-11/12

To Receive Items of Correspondence

1. Nalc Consultation of Amend. To Code of Conduct
2. Rugby Economic Prosperity Strategy
3. Zurich Insurance. Round Avenue Lighting Column
4. WALC compensation Scheme and PC Investments
5. Funding for Village Projects
6. Travel Tokens Scrutiny Review
7. Dedicated e-mail box for reports of faulty St Lights
8. Thank you letter from Roundabout
9. Letter re Doves
10. Letter re Doves to Solicitors re Sunrise
11. Grass Cutting 08/09 response
12. Allotment Provision Information to RBC
13. Replacement bowls Order L/Heath St. Lighting.
14. Replacement St. Lighting Column Thomas Way
15. Mrs Thomas and Mr Young – Pumping Station
16. Mrs Wyatt request for copy of official response to Climafuel Planning Application and reply to inform that official response not yet finalised until 11.11.08
17. Letters to residents re Doves/Pigeons
18. Code of Conduct authority members and employees
19. Zurich Insurance new postal address
20. LCR Magazine
21. St. Lighting Problem Round Ave/Ashman Ave – Resolved
22. Unfilled Sandbags offer from WCC
23. Request to waive clause in L/Heath Lease for Bonfire Event 8.11.08
24. Response from Solicitors re Sunrise
25. Insurance Claim against PC – Accident 3.10.07
26. Acknowledgement of 25 above sent
27. Covering letter to Zurich Ins re 25 above
28. Request from Veolia for schedule of grass cutting carried out in 2007
29. WALC Newsletter ADH/79

08-11/13

To Receive Reports on Minor Matters and Items for Future Agenda

Cllr. Mrs Watson informed that the plan to remove metal fencing by the basketball court had been decided was too expensive and that costs were being considered for installing retractable wooden bollards by Youth Crime and Prevention as an alternative proposal.

Cllr. Mrs Watson informed that the probation service had been contacted with regard to the wall behind the Pavilion. There is a window frame which needs to come out and be bricked up. The probation team have agreed to have a look at the problem. Cllr. Mrs Watson to chase up the probation service.

Cllr. Mrs Watson requested that the Clerk place a leaflet onto the Notice Board.

Cllr. Mrs Wyatt commented on the Bus Stop shelter on Lawford Road at the junction with the Green. Cllr. Mrs Watson informed that this was due to be replaced.

CW
DG

08-11/14

Date and Time of the Next Meeting

It was confirmed by the Chairman that the next meeting is scheduled for Tuesday 9th December 08 at 7.30pm in the Memorial Hall, Long Lawford. Meeting was declared closed at 9.55pm

Signed: ................................................................. Date: .................................................................

Mr K Rye
Chairman
**Minutes of the Long Lawford Parish Council Meeting Held on Tuesday 14th October 2008 in the Memorial Hall, Railway Street, Long Lawford**

**Present:**
- Cllr. Mr K Rye - Chairman (KR)
- Miss D Groves - Clerk (DG)
- Cllr. Mr M Davison - Vice-Chairman (MD)
- Cllr. Mrs E Clark (EC)
- Borough Cllr. Mrs S. Bragg (SB)
- Cllr. Mr R Cleton (RC)
- Cllr. Mrs P Wyatt (PW)
- Cllr. Mrs C. Watson (CW)
- Cllr. Mrs J Slack (JS)
- County Cllr. Mr D Hodkinson (DH)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minute</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 08-10/01 | Opening of Meeting and Apologies for Absence  
Acting Chairman Cllr. Mr Davison welcomed everyone and opened the meeting at 7.30pm. Cllrs. Mrs Lock and Mr Conroy-Hargreaves apologised for absence due to being away from the area and illness. |
| 08-10/02 | Standing Orders were Instated  
Due to the retirement of the Chairman, Cllr. Mrs Clark nominated Cllr. Mr Rye as the new Chairman, seconded by Cllr. Mrs Slack. Cllr. Mr Rye agreed to be nominated. All were in favour. Cllr. Mr Rye thanked everyone for the vote of confidence and commented how sorry he was that Cllr. Mr Draper had resigned and left the Council. He further proposed that a letter be drafted to thank Cllr. Mr Draper for his sterling efforts on behalf of the Council, seconded by Cllr. Mrs Watson and agreed by all. |
| 08-10/03 | Declaration of a Casual Vacancy  
It was declared that there was a casual vacancy on the Long Lawford & Little Lawford Parish Council. The notice to be placed on the Notice Board, it was noted that there was a set format for the procedure. |
| 08-10/04 | To Receive Police Report  
A copy of the police report had been received and was circulated. Community Support Officers reported being aware of binge drinking, some of which was by under age drinkers and perpetrators were mostly residents of the Village. They would continue to work together with the Police to tackle the issue. |
| 08-10/05 | To Invite Members of the Public to Speak on Matters of Concern  
The Chairman informed that this was the opportunity for members of the public to speak and confirmed that in accordance with the Parish Council’s standing orders, this would be for 30 mins in total, allowing for 2 minutes per person, time permitting and depending on the complexity of the issue.  
It was asked whether the boundary hedge in the King George’s field could be looked at as litter was collecting at the base of the hedge. It was confirmed that the hedge would be placed on the agenda for the November meeting. Progress on the white doves was questioned. The Chairman responded that this would be addressed under matters arising on the Agenda. It was questioned whether the Cement works planning application would be discussed, this was confirmed as an item to be discussed by the Council under planning matters.  
Mrs LP objected to the contents of the minutes of the 9th September 08 meeting regarding her conduct. Mrs LP wanted to object to the Cemex planning application for a cement manufacturing facility at Malpass Farm in that she believed that there would be high particulate pollution and pollutants from water vapour in the air, it was requested that this be taken into consideration when the Council discussed the application later on the Agenda. |
| 08-10/06 | To Receive Declarations of Personal or Other Interest  
Cllr. Mrs Watson declared a personal interest in matters relating to Warwickshire County Council (a family member is a County Councillor). Cllr. Mrs Wyatt declared a personal interest in matters relating to Livingstone Avenue, Boughton Leigh Charities and Rugby in Plume. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>08-10-07</th>
<th>To Approve the Minutes of the Meeting held on Tuesday 9th September 2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|          | Cllr. Mrs Wyatt questioned why a letter from Cllr. Mr Draper referred to in the Minutes was not
|          | minutest in full. Cllr. Mrs Watson enquired whether a copy of the letter would be on file with the
|          | Minutes. This was confirmed. No further comments received. |
|          | Borough Councillor Mrs Bragg noted that she had left the meeting later than had been recorded in
|          | the Minutes. No comments received. |
|          | Cllr. Mrs Wyatt went on to discuss accuracy of previous approved Minutes of the Parish meeting
|          | held in July. The Chairman reminded Cllr. Mrs Wyatt that there was to be no discussion of
|          | previous approved minutes. |
|          | Cllr. Mr Cleton informed that his name had been omitted from the attendance list and it was
|          | agreed by all he had been in attendance. The Clerk apologised for the error. |
|          | It was proposed by Cllr. Mrs Clark, seconded by Cllr. Mr Cleton and agreed by all, except Cllr. Mrs
|          | Wyatt, who abstained to accept the Minutes of the 9th September meeting with the amendment
|          | showing that Cllr. Mr Cleton was in attendance. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>08-10-08</th>
<th>To Receive Progress Reports on Outstanding Items Not Covered Later on the Agenda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|          | Cllr. Mrs Watson informed that she had secured the name of the Solicitors dealing with
|          | the property known as Sunrise and proposed that a letter be written to the Solicitors to ask that
|          | the owners of the property be made aware of the problems faced by residents in the area regarding
|          | the Doves and to include advice taken from the Environmental Department at RBC and the pigeon
|          | control advice service – Tel 023 925 83540 10-3pm, seconded by Cllr. Mrs Slack and agreed by
|          | all. |
|          | Cllr. Mrs Wyatt referred to Page 397 of the 9th September Minutes and requested that a copy of
|          | the letter sent to Cllr. Mr Draper from the Developers in Back Lane confirming that the pumping
|          | station would be taken over by Severn Trent be copied to Miss Thomas from Back Lane. It was
|          | pointed out that the Minutes did not state that a letter had been received by Cllr. Mr Draper, it had
|          | been reported that he had been informed that this would be the case. Cllr. Mrs Watson reported
|          | that there was no concrete evidence available to confirm that Severn Trent would take over the
|          | pumping station. Cllr. Mr Draper had been informed that this would happen. It was seconded by
|          | Cllr. Mrs Watson that a letter be sent informing Miss Thomas that the Council had been informed
|          | that Severn Trent would be taking over the pumping station, agreed by all. |
|          | Cllr. Mrs Wyatt informed that she had not received a copy of the speed restriction report. The
|          | Clerk confirmed that the report had been sent to all Cllrs. on 28th September 08. All other Cllrs.
|          | agreed receipt of the report. |
|          | The Clerk informed of a reported problem with 4 ST lights not working in Round Avenue, received
|          | from WCC Mike Cunningham who had, on the Council’s behalf, instructed E.On to carry out the
|          | repairs, on inspection it was believed that the problem was with an underground cable running
|          | underneath one of the Council’s Lighting Columns. As E.On did not have the equipment to remove
|          | the lighting column to gain access to the cable, WCC were asked to remove the column for them.
|          | WCC had telephoned the Clerk to request permission to go ahead and give approval for the
|          | column to be temporarily removed by WCC at a cost of £75 plus VAT and at the expense of the
|          | Parish Council. The Clerk did not give the permission and has since spoken with E.On directly
|          | who are informing that the column needs to be removed to carry out the repair. The Clerk informed
|          | that she did not believe it should be the responsibility of the Parish to pay to have the column
|          | removed if there was nothing wrong with the column itself. The Council agreed with this and
|          | requested that a letter be sent to the Parish Council requesting what needs to be done before any
|          | decisions are made. It was confirmed that the lighting column had been made safe. |

Post Meeting Note. E-mail was sent 15.10.08 requesting information about what /where
To Receive Borough/County Council Reports

**Borough Councillors Mrs Bragg and Mrs Watson**

Holbrook Road Garage Site – Some of the garages behind the shops are due for demolition. Possible uses for the site either community garden or allotments. BCllr. Mrs Watson reported last month site had been allocated to the Alley gate Review Group. Received notification that Surveyor thinks it unlikely that the site would be suitable for a garden or allotments or for development.

Emergency ASB meeting held with different groups from RBC who were looking at the site. It was decided best use of the area would be for enclosed secure parking with an alley gate. Main complications being rights of way across the land by local residents. Creating secure parking would still allow these rights of way. It was felt that this was a positive meeting and there should be big improvements to ASB in this area.

**Earl Craven Locality Panel – Personnel from Coventry Airport and Police gave a report on the air crash in the summer. It was disappointing to hear of a marked increase in the number of ASB reported incidents from Police in Long Lawford, this is thought to be because residents have been urged to report more. A talk was given by RBC Planning regarding consultation on the Future of Rugby. Information concerning the “Leader” project from WCC giving funding for Art and Horticulture projects in the rural areas. The Gardening Club and the School can make application to this and if anyone knows of any other groups then please contact Borough Councillors. Paul Collett mentioned proposals to allow RBC officers, wardens and police the right to confiscate alcohol from people drinking in ANY PUBLIC PLACE IF they are causing antisocial behaviour due to being under the influence of alcohol. This to be in addition to present powers to remove alcohol from underage drinkers. Consumption at regulated outdoor events/picnics will not be affected unless antisocial behaviour occurs.

**Cement Forum** – A workshop facilitated by the Environment Council to find a way forward for the Forum was attended. Many ideas were presented and opinions given. A smaller group has been set up to move on from this and to report back to the workshop at a later time. BCllr. Mrs Watson attended the Cement Forum meeting. Cemex talked about plans for a cement manufacturing plant (MBT – mechanical biological treatment) at Malpass Farm. Public consultation is ongoing. Cemex plan to hold an exhibition on Thursday 23rd and Friday 24th October at Cemex House from 2-6pm and from 10am-2pm on Saturday 25th October. All residents are invited and urged to attend where Cemex personnel will be on hand to answer any questions. The outcome of the planning application will be determined by WCC and any response you have to the application will be accepted right up until the day it goes before the committee, but it is advisable to get the responses in as soon as possible.

**John Barford Car Park** – Cabinet meeting agreed that the car park should resort to its usual closing time at the end of the trial period of extended opening to 8pm. Anybody wishing to gain access to their car once the car park is closed will need to pay £100 charge. Free car parking would be available on Tuesdays and Saturdays prior to Christmas in this car park only.

**Dog Control Orders** – Proposal to introduce Dog Control Orders, limiting where dogs could be exercised off lead and ban dogs from play areas and schools, aims to tackle irresponsible dog ownership and dog fouling. It is not the Council’s intention to cover paths over fields or all rights of ways etc. the intention is to ensure public safety. RBC regularly receives complaints about dog faeces in children’s play areas and on sports pitches and is looking to bring in the new legislation to help tackle the problem. Dog control orders are easier for the council to enforce and should result in lower levels of dog fouling. The period for residents to respond to the consultation has been extended to 12 December to allow as many people as possible to have their say. The Council will wait for the consultation period to finish, gathering views before any decisions are made.

**Warwickshire County Council** – WCC are once again giving away free computers to community or voluntary organisations. Please contact the County website or phone 01926 412020.

**Lawford Heath Lane** – This lane will be closed for three weeks between October 27th and December 12th for carriageway repairs. Work is expected to start on the 10th November.
County Councillor Mr D Hodkinson

   There is only a small amount to report this month. After waiting in vain for the Officers to contact me, I contacted them and arranged to meet them to go over the responses received to the Consultation. Unfortunately this cannot take place until next week. In respect of the Parish Council’s views, they have had a brief reply from your Clerk; so I have it in mind to provide the Minutes of your discussion to help them understand your viewpoint in greater depth. This is because your views and their natural inclinations – to proceed with the scheme – are in direct conflict, something I will need to deal with by insisting on reflecting on the alternative courses of action open in the limited S.106 time scale available. No consultation on a WCC-preferred scheme would normally proceed except with my support. I have specifically withheld my support for any specific course of action for the moment, to enforce this thorough analysis of options.
   In that connection, it would help me to know for next week’s meeting whether one comment recorded in the Minutes reflected only an individual view or was shared more widely than that:
   “…However, on the Rugby Road side (East Side) it was commented that a cross hatch junction with pedestrian traffic lights could be implemented and the rest of the 106 money be used to improve footways.”

2. Back Lane and Bilton Lane footpath schemes.
   The detailing of these schemes is highly dependent on the approach finally adopted for the A428 junction. I continue to wish to see a single integrated set of proposals considered and adopted, whether implemented all in one go, or one after another, in order to see that public money is spent to the best practicable effect. To achieve proper integration of the two elements, therefore, I am meeting both the Signals Engineers and the Engineer dealing with the footpath schemes.

3. Speed Restrictions, Back Lane and Bilton Lane.
   Nothing fresh to report.

4. Proposed “Upgrade” to Bridleway of Footpath R128 between Bilton Lane and Lawford Heath Lane.
   I mentioned this matter some months ago when handing over copies of the Definitive Footpaths Map for the Parish. I recently took the opportunity both to visit much of the route with two of the local farmers (who are rootedly opposed to the proposal) and to obtain a subsequent briefing from the Footpaths people at Shire Hall, which goes some way to providing the pro-Bridleway arguments. My understanding is that the next stage is for a Planning Inspector to hold an Inquiry on the matter, in the light of which he/she will then determine the issue at stake.
   There seems to be a fundamental factual disagreement between contending parties over whether the footpath in question has or has not been used habitually by Members of the Public on horseback over an extended period of time. The Parish Council ought to be advised of the Inquiry in due course. I will advise as soon as I hear anything further.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>08-10/10</th>
<th>To Consider the Exclusion of the Public and Press for Consideration of the following items:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Item 11.A.I. - Confidentiality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cllr. Mrs Watson suggested that this item be discussed at the end of the Agenda, this was agreed by all</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>08-10/11</th>
<th>To Receive Reports from Sub-Committees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A. Finance &amp; Administration Panel/Clerk</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
a. **Briefing Event for Chairmen** – The Chairman confirmed he would be available to attend. It was proposed by Cllr. Mrs Watson, seconded by Cllr. Mrs Wyatt and agreed by all that a place should be booked at a cost of £25 per place for the Chairman. It was proposed by Cllr. Mr Clifton, seconded by Cllr. Mr Rye and agreed by all that the Vice-Chairman also attend. It was proposed by Cllr. Mrs Clark, seconded by Cllr. Mr Davison and agreed by all that the Clerk also attend. It was confirmed that the Clerk would be accepted to attend the Briefing Event.

b. **The making and enforcement of Byelaws** – The Chairman explained the proposal. Parishes would have the power to put forward and implement Byelaws. This would be done in 2 stages, some could be passed by local Council’s others would still need central government approval. Enforcement would be carried out by way of fixed penalty fines; £75 was the suggested amount by the collecting office of the Council. The Parish would need to employ someone to deal with the collection of fines and training would need to be provided. Cllrs. would not be allowed to collect fines. The Chairman thought that the Parish Council should put forward a positive response to the idea. Proposed by Cllr. Mr Davison, seconded by Cllr. Mr Rye and agreed by all. The Chairman to draft a response.

c. **Core Strategy Consultation** – Cllr. Mrs Watson reported the main areas being looked at were new homes and employment. It was agreed that the Chairman and vice-chairman look at the documentation and draft some views which will then be circulated to all Cllrs. to add opinions before a formal response is given.

d. **To Consider Freedom of Information Act – New Model Publication Scheme** – Cllrs. Mr Davison and Mrs Clark to look at the documentation. Cllr. Mrs Watson requested that notes be circulated to everyone via e-mail when all Cllrs. could express their opinion before a formal response is given.

e. **To Consider Grass Cutting/Rubbish Removal 2009/10** – Cllr. Mrs Wyatt expressed concern about the extra responsibility involved and the cost. Figures quoted from the Council would not be enough to cover what the Parish Council would need to do and therefore Cllr. Mrs Wyatt was against the idea. It was further commented that whilst the idea can work for smaller Councils, Long Lawford was too large a Village for it to be a feasible option. Further comments were, it cannot be done for the amount of money available, training and risk assessments would need to be carried out and the question of why the Parish should collect litter when the Borough Council doesn’t. It was proposed by Cllr. Mrs Slack, seconded by Cllr. Mrs Wyatt and agreed by all not to adopt the proposal. The Clerk to respond.

f. **To Consider Standing Orders point 4 Interests** – It was suggested that the Finance and Administration panel look at the new wording of this point and make a suggestion to full Council at its next meeting in November.

g. **Allotment Provision** – The Clerk was given details of contact names to supply the information requested by RBC.

h. **Remembrance Sunday Service** – Cllrs. Mrs Wyatt and Mr Rye to attend.

i. **To Consider Memorial Wreath** – It was proposed by Cllr. Mrs Slack, seconded by Cllr. Mr Davison and agreed by all that a donation of £25 be made for the provision of a Memorial Wreath. Cllr. Mrs Watson informed that the cheque should be made payable to Royal British Legion – Long Lawford Branch. Cllr. Mrs Clark volunteered to represent the Parish Council at the Memorial Hall remembrance service.

j. **To Consider Request for Permission to use Lawford Heath Rec Ground for Fireworks Display** – The Clerk outlined the request – Clause in Lease needs letter to RBC requesting one off permission to use the field for fireworks. Possible Event Permit needed from RBC, granted as long as the Police don’t object. Public Liability Insurance must be obtained by the organisers of the event up to 1 million pounds cover for up to 250 people. DTI guidelines must be followed to validate any insurance claim. Clerk has provided all details together with insurance application form and event permit application form to the organisers and outlined what needs to
be done before permission could be granted. Cllrs. Mrs. Watson suggested that the Clerk requests the organisers to put in writing to the Parish Council what they wish to do. It was proposed by Cllr Mrs. Watson, seconded by Cllr. Mr. Clayton and agreed by all to grant permission to the event organisers. It was further pointed out that the recreation field must be cleared of all litter, spent fireworks etc. and returned to the same state prior to the event. Cllr. Mr. Davidson was requested to ask whether the Council would consider making a donation under Section 137 towards the costs of the event. It was generally agreed that this was not acceptable as it could set a precedent. Post meeting Note: Clerk has telephoned the organisers and written to outline the above conditions and is currently waiting to hear back from the organisers.

k: To Consider Request for views/advice/proposals relating to the footpath schemes in Back Lane and Bilton Lane from Cllr. Mr. Hodkinson – The Clerk read out a draft letter outlining what had previously been agreed on the subject matter at previous Parish Council meetings. It was proposed by Cllr. Mr. Davidson, seconded by Cllr. Mrs. Clark and agreed by all to send the letter to Cllr. Mr. Hodkinson.

B. Recreation Grounds
C. Play and Leisure Group

a) 106 Agreement Play Equipment Update – RBC have confirmed that the 106 agreement has been amended and is due to be signed by all parties. There is a meeting on 24th October to determine the particulars. Terms and Conditions need to be agreed to by the Manufacturer. Letter needs to be sent to the Borough Council confirming that other quotes/equipment has been looked at prior to reaching decisions on what has been agreed to purchase by the Parish Council. Cllr. Mrs. Wyatt commented that she was not happy with the siting of the equipment. Cllr. Mrs. Watson replied that the siting of the equipment had been agreed months previous. It was proposed by Cllr. Mrs. Slack, seconded by Cllr. Mrs. Clark that Cllr. Mrs. Watson be asked to draft a letter to the Borough Council on behalf of the Parish Council, agreed by all, except Cllr. Mrs. Wyatt who was against the proposal.

D. Transport, Highways, Drains and Street Lighting

a) To Consider replacement St. Lighting Column Thomas Way – It was proposed by Cllr. Mrs. Watson, seconded by Cllr. Mr. Clayton and agreed by all to replace the lighting column due to it being badly rusted at the bottom.

b) To Consider St. Lighting Columns x 3 Bowls Lawford Heath and Emergency call out fees – The Clerk reported that due to vandalism, 3 bowls had been smashed to 3 lighting columns at Lawford Heath, this had resulted in an emergency call out to make the columns safe at a cost of £172.81. It was proposed by Cllr. Mrs. Watson, seconded by Cllr. Mrs. Slack and agreed by all that the Clerk be requested to enquire whether an insurance claim can be made to replace the bowls, but that in the meantime replacement bowls be ordered anyway.

08-10-12

12. To Receive Details of Financial Matters
   a) To Receive and Approve Accounts for Payment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>CHQ NO.</th>
<th>ISSUED TO</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14.10.08</td>
<td>1643/50/51/52</td>
<td>Confidential</td>
<td>£1,062.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.10.08</td>
<td>1653</td>
<td>HMRC Tax &amp; NI due Oct 08</td>
<td>£102.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.10.08</td>
<td>1654</td>
<td>Telecorns Oct</td>
<td>£23.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.10.08</td>
<td>1655</td>
<td>Petty Cash Vouchers 81-86</td>
<td>£108.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.10.08</td>
<td>1656</td>
<td>WCC Emergency Call Out</td>
<td>£172.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.10.08</td>
<td>1657</td>
<td>Roundabout Grant 08/09</td>
<td>£100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.10.08</td>
<td>1658</td>
<td>Graffiti Hotline – Removal Kit</td>
<td>£82.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
14.10.08 1659 E.On - Replacement Lighting Column Round Avenue, Insurance Claim £981.13

Income September 2208
11.9.08 LLawford Football Club 08/09 Season £200
15.9.08 RBC Precept Little Lawford £465
15.9.08 RBC Precept Long Lawford £24,535

Bank Balance at 30th September 08 = £38,134.00

Cllr. Mrs Wyatt asked why the Parish Council was paying the Clerk £23.50 per month for provision of Broadband. Cllr. Mrs Wyatt was reminded by the Clerk that this was a private and confidential matter and should not be discussed in public. Cllr. Mrs Wyatt replied that she had mentioned it on previous occasions. Cllr. Mrs Watson commented that it was a private and confidential matter which had been agreed at the commencement of the Clerk's appointment and was part of her contract and should be the end of the matter. Cllr. Mrs Wyatt commented that invoices should be seen each month prior to approval for payment. The Clerk informed that the invoices are and have always been available to view/inspect at every monthly Parish Council meeting. It was proposed by Cllr. Mrs Clark, seconded by Cllr. Mr Cleton and approved by all to accept the accounts for payment.

b) Bank Reconciliation – The Chairman confirmed that a Finance Committee meeting had taken place and that all accounts were in order and approved by the Committee. It was proposed by Cllr. Mrs Clark, seconded by Cllr. Mrs Slack and approved by all to accept the Bank Reconciliation.

08-10/13 To Receive Details of Planning Matters

- R08/1071/PLN – Installation of a 7.3m diameter antenna within existing cluster of satellite dishes, Earth Station, Lawford Heath Lane, Long Lawford.
  RBC has approved the above planning application.

- R410/08CM027 – Retention of a weighbridge ticket kiosk for improved monitoring and security of inbound and outbound HGV's carrying raw materials at entrance access to Rugby Cement Works, Rugby Cement Works, Lawford Road, Rugby.
  Warwickshire County Council has approved the above planning application.


Questions were asked about the GRP flue, no dimensions or where the kiosks were to be sited was mentioned in the planning application. Cllr. Mrs Watson confirmed that it would be 8m at its highest point, it would be dark green in colour. No pumps would be involved. There was a report on trees which would have to be removed, saplings only. No badger sets had been found. Cllr. Mrs Watson questioned whether there would be extra traffic visible from the surrounding area, though not from the street.

- S965/08CM033 – Development of a Climafuel Manufacturing Facility to supply Rugby Cement Works with solid recovered fuel manufactured from mixed household and commercial and industrial waste. The facility would combine a range of waste treatment, sorting, recycling and processing equipment to separate and remove recyclable materials from the mixed wastes, and to shred and biodegradable non-recyclable materials into Climafuel.
  The Old Cement Works, Southam Quarry, Long Itchington, Coventry Road, Southam.
• R410/08CM038 – Same as S966/08CM033 above. Molpass Farm, Parkfield Road, Rugby.
  Cllr. Mrs Wyatt commented that the Climafuel applications above were not the same. Cllr.
  Mr Hodkinson commented that in principle they were the same. Cllr. Mrs Clark had
  concerns about the traffic movements. Cllr. Mr Davison produced notes on his initial
  thoughts after looking at the plans, the contents of which were discussed; extra noise and
  air pollution; too close to the urban population of town and villages; the possible impact if
  an accident occurred. Cllr. Mrs Wyatt reported attending a Rugby Cement Community
  Forum meeting where it was reported that Cemex would be importing waste from parts of
  Europe. Cllr. Mrs Wyatt had chlorine concerns and noted that the scoping document
  doesn’t say where lorries would be coming from. Cllr. Mr Cleaton thought that everything
  was going to be in sealed units. Cllr. Mrs Watson and Cllr. Mrs Slack talked of Landfill –
  WCC by 2012 has to reduce landfill or face a one million pound fine which will be borne
  by Council Tax payers, something has to be done to find a solution to the Landfill
  problem. It was proposed by Cllr. Mrs Clark, seconded by Cllr. Mrs Wyatt and agreed by
  all, except Cllr. Mrs Watson to accept Cllr. Mr Davison’s comments, however, prior to
  submitting an official response Cllr. Mr Rye and Cllr. Mr Davison to formulate a reply to
  incorporate all comments put forward, this would then be circulated for additional
  comments by Cllrs. prior to an official response being voted on and submitted in response
  to the Planning Application.

Cllrs. Mr Hodkinson and Mrs Bragg left the meeting

08-10-14

To Receive Items of Correspondence

1. Consultation on Future of Rugby
2. Closure of Audit Notice
3. Bus Stops Back Lane Thank you letter
5. Damaged Lighting Bowls at Lawford Heath
6. Dog Control Order
7. Assessment of Speed Limits Back Lane/Silton Lane
8. Training Events WALC
9. Terms of Ref. Draft change to the Assessment process
10. Letter re Footpath Back Lane/Silton Lane – Parishioner
11. Cllr. Wyatt request to view Ext Auditors Report
12. Appointment for Cllr. Mrs Wyatt for 11 above
13. Decision of PC for Monitoring Officer at RBC not to release Minutes to member of public
14. Noise assessment determination by RBC
15. Advertising RBC Fun Days for 2009 – Inclusion in Newsletter
16. Various Funding Opportunities available
17. Remembrance Sunday Service Info.
18. RAC next meeting
19. Freedom of Information Act – New Publication Scheme
20. Byelaws
21. Core Strategy preferred Options Paper
22. Vandalised St. Lights at the Ryelands
23. C. Fisher – Dangerous parking chapel St and Cross St
24. Red Telephone Boxes
25. Training for chairman
26. Training Changes to Town and Country Planning System
27. Standards Committee Representative Required
28. Cllr. Mrs Lock e-mail re Pigeon issue
29. Community Aggregates Fund 08/09
30. Allotment Provision Information Request from RBC
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>08-10-15</th>
<th><strong>Councillors Reports and Items for Future Agenda</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Chairman agreed to draft a letter to residents near “Sunrise” regarding the Pigeons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cllr. Mrs Clark reported that half of the ditch in South View Road had been cleared of weeds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Could the Clerk enquire whether the other half will be done?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cllr. Mrs Clark informed that it would not now be possible to represent the PC in the wreath laying at the Memorial Hall. Cllr. Mr Cleton to ask Trish if she would represent the Parish Council, failing which Cllr. Mr Rye would attend to it. Cllr. Mr Cleton to inform Cllr. Mr Rye.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cllr. Mrs Watson asked that the handyman check the recreation grounds for areas that need to be strimmed. It was reported that the strimming that Cllr. Mrs Watson had requested to be done in the week had been carried out the day after it was requested. It was commented by Cllr. Mrs Slack that the handyman had been quick to respond to a request recently made. Cllr. Mrs Watson didn’t feel that she should have to ask that strimming be done, checks should be done regularly. Cllr. Mrs Watson requested that the purchase of Bulbs be placed on the Agenda for November. The hedge opposite the Church on the left hand side of Chapel Street needed attention and the Clerk was requested to place it on the Agenda for November. Following an Anti-Social Behaviour group meeting it was decided that a letter should be sent to residents of Boyce Way to inform and ask for comments regarding the staggered gating proposed in the area. Clerk to place on the Agenda for November. The PC office and Computer requested for inclusion on the Agenda for November. Request for an updated address list for Councillors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cllr. Mrs Slack reported stinging nettles on the pavement near Main St and Cross St. This was a WCC issue. Cllr. Mrs Slack to report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cllr. Mrs Wyatt reported that the footpath at School Street/Round Avenue needed attention. Cllr. Mr Rye to look at it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unadopted Highways was requested to be placed on the Agenda for November.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cllr. Mr Cleton reported of 15/16 yr old youths late at night in the top playing field. Any reporting needs to be done at the time. Cllr. Mr Cleton informed of Spare Lighting Units at a former Clrs. property who has requested that they be collected.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 08-10-10 | **Item 11 A 1 – Employees Annual Leave/ Salaries/Clerk Appraisal** – Discussion commenced on the subject when Cllr. Mrs Watson commented that she was not prepared to discuss the issue of salary reviews as she was unaware of what the handyman did. The Clerk reported that it had been previously discussed and agreed that the Clerk would report to the Finance and Admin. Committee regarding his activities and as the employees’ line manager, if there were any concerns, she would raise them with the Council. Cllr. Mrs Clark enquired whether the handyman had a job description, this was confirmed. Cllr. Mr Davison and Cllr. Mr Rye commented that no appraisal/salary review had been carried out for the Clerk in 21 months and that this was a contractual obligation. Cllr. Mrs Watson and Cllr. Mrs Wyatt then left the meeting. It was agreed by the remaining Clrs. to place the item on the Agenda for another meeting and to look at carrying out a staff appraisal/salary review for the Clerk as soon as possible. The Clerk, as line manager, to carry out staff appraisals for all other employees after which salary reviews could then be looked at. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>08-10-16</th>
<th><strong>Date and Time of the Next Meeting</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To confirm the date and time of the next meeting which is scheduled for Tuesday 11th November 08 at 7.30pm in the Memorial Hall, Long Lawford. Meeting declared closed at 10.20pm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Signed:  
Mr K Rye  
Chairman  

Date: 11/11/08
MINUTES OF THE LONG LAWFORD PARISH COUNCIL MEETING HELD ON TUESDAY
9th September 2008 IN THE MEMORIAL HALL, RAILWAY STREET, LONG LAWFORD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Present:</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cllr. Mr D Draper</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Chairman (DD)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miss D Groves</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Clerk (DG)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr. Mr M Davison</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Vice-Chairman (MD)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr. Mrs E Clark</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- (EC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr. Mr M. Conroy-Hargeaves</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- (MC-H)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borough Cllr. Mrs. S. Bragg</td>
<td>(SB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Cllr. Mr D Hodkinson</td>
<td>(DH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr. Mrs S. Lock</td>
<td>(SL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr. Mrs C. Watson</td>
<td>(CW)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr. Mrs J Slack</td>
<td>(JS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr. Mrs P Wyatt</td>
<td>(PW)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minute</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08-09/01</td>
<td>Opening of Meeting and Apologies for Absence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairman Cllr. Mr Draper welcomed everyone and opened the meeting at 7.30pm.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 08-09/02 | To Receive Police Report |
| The Clerk reported receiving apologies from Chris Fisher for his absence. A copy of the police report had been received and the Clerk was asked to circulate to all Councillors. |
| DG |

| 08-09/03 | To Invite Members of the Public to Speak on Matters of Concern |
| It was reported that on 29th August an incident occurred involving approx. 20 youths being noisy until 5 am in the King George's playing field, there had been a smell of burning and a bonfire had been lit, front gates of Sunrise were also removed. Police were called the next morning and informed that the incident would best have been notified whilst it was occurring. |
| A further report was received regarding persistent dangerous parking on the corners of Cross St and Chapel Street. The Clerk was asked to contact the Police. |
| The pigeon population at Sunrise, discussed at the July meeting was again reported. The Council explained that this was outside the remit of the Parish Council as the doves were privately owned. It was suggested that an organisation called MITE may be of some assistance. |
| It was reported that Market Harborugh had just completed a project involving park equipment. Cllr. Mrs Watson took a note of the location. |
| DG |

| 08-09/04 | Standing Orders were instated |

| 08-09/05 | To Approve the Minutes of the Meeting held on Tuesday 8th July 2008. |
| Cllr. Mrs Wyatt handed over a list to the Chairman which contained the following: |

- A Parishioner's title was Miss and not Mrs several places (page 388 and 389) |
- A Parishioner's name was misspelt twice (page 389) |
- Last item standing orders were instated is incorrect. They do not have to be suspended when it is an agenda item nor reinstated (Page 389). Post meeting Note: After checking Clerk's minutes, Standing Orders were instated as per every Parish Council meeting, there were not suspended, nor reinstated (page 389) |
- And Cllr. Mrs Wyatt distributed a proposal to make an important correction to the June Minutes before the meeting commenced (page 389). Post meeting Note: After checking Clerk's minutes, the proposal referred to was distributed after Standing Orders were instated and not before the meeting commenced. |
- At the bottom of page 389 should read - members of the driving public. Post meeting Note: after checking Clerk's minutes, no mention of the driving public. |
- Page 394 top. | | | |
- I would prefer to see the incoming football fee separate 08-07/09. Cllr. Mrs Watson |

396
added that this was usual practice.

- I find it unacceptable to not record the list of correspondence and when I looked twice on the Notice Board the list was not on display. Clerk reported that the correspondence list was displayed on the Notice Board along with the Minutes for 2 weeks.
- 08-07/12 Mrs Clarke and Mrs Wyatt not Mrs Slack, she was due on holiday?

No comments were received regarding list of comments above.

Cllr. Mr Draper commented that at the top of page 389 – should read Back Lane and not Townsend Lane.

It was proposed by Cllr. Mrs Clark, seconded by Cllr. Mr Davison and agreed by all to accept the Minutes of the 8th July meeting. (Cllr. Mrs Watson commented “accepts the Minutes, with amendments”)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>08-09/06</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To Receive Progress Reports on Outstanding Items Not Covered Later on the Agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr. Mrs Wyatt proposed that the Clerk writes to Mrs Alison Hodge regarding rules and regulations upon public participation. No comments from any other Councillors.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cllr. Mrs Wyatt: Did the Clerk obtain a quote from the National Pigeon Association. The Clerk reported that the number given had been incorrect and that there had been no reply from the Pigeon Control Advisory Council either. It was further pointed out that it was not in the Parish Council’s jurisdiction to get rid of the pigeons as had been advised at the 8th July Parish meeting.

Cllr. Mrs Wyatt: Sewerage problem Back Lane – Has Cllr Mr Draper investigated. Cllr. Mr Draper informed that he would report when Cllr. Mrs Wyatt had finished.

Cllr. Mrs Wyatt: Page 389. My resolution was not read out aloud or properly presented verbally for discussion. My proposal, written and presented to each Councillor and voted upon, should therefore be included within the Minutes. The Clerk noted that she had not been asked for the item to be placed on the Agenda and was unaware that the resolution was to be handed out. No Councillor, having read the proposal had any comments to make when invited to do so by the Chairman, the Chairman asked if anyone agreed with any of the comments contained therein. No comments were made. Cllr. Mrs Wyatt’s resolution was not voted on, it was not an agenda item, and no comments were made.

Cllr. Mrs Wyatt 08-07/06 Have we been given a copy of the Noise Assessment? Clerk reported that the Noise Assessment had been sent to all Cllrs. on the Play Committee plus Cllr. Mrs Wyatt, as requested, on 11th July 08. All other Councillors confirmed receipt of the document.

Cllr. Mr Draper informed that he had contacted officials regarding the pumping station and the problem with sewerage in Back Lane. It has been confirmed to him by the developers and Rugby Borough Council that Severn Trent will be taking over the pumping station and that if problems arose in the meantime, Mr Mel Walster Tel: 01827 283224 should be contacted. After hours and week-ends the contact is Mr Steve Barband Tel: 07836 722755.

Cllr. Mr Draper informed that the litter height at Ling Hall Quarry was confirmed by the Environmental Agency as being within their specifications. He further reported that Lawford Heath Lane is due to have the North end resurfaced some time this month. The drains would also be addressed at the same time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>08-09/07</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To Receive Borough/County Council Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Councillor Mr Hodkinson:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associated footpath schemes, Back Lane and Bilton Lane - County Cllr. Mr Hodkinson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
reported that a pair of combined draft proposals for the footpath routes for Back Lane and Bilton Lane had been circulated to the Clerk and to the five households in Back Lane plus the two farming interests along Bilton Lane. (At this point a Parishioner interjected and the Chairman suspended standing orders and allowed them to speak) they asked what would happen to the hedge situated in front of a parishioners property were a path to be put in its place. It was replied that any proposals would be looked at carefully before any decisions were made. County Cllr. Mr Hodkinson intended to sit down with Design Engineers involved over the choice of route. The main focus being Back Lane, Bilton Lane issues have largely been resolved through work done to date. County Cllr. Mr Hodkinson requested a short letter from the Clerk setting out any views and advice that the Council have to share with the Engineers. There will then follow a more formal consultation, on a single proposition, on which it was anticipated that the County would consult with all those consulted on the Traffic Signals scheme, plus both the Bilton Lane agricultural interests and the residents of the Tee Tong Road development. He further asked if anyone has views to please put them in and when the consultation is over, all the views, lots of them, would be looked to allow for a way to move forward.

Suggested speed restrictions, Back Lane and Bilton Lane – Inquiry was made on behalf of the Parish Council about the possibility of speed limits on both Lanes. A carefully written report had been received and forwarded to the Clerk. The Clerk was asked to circulate the report to all Councillors. The Conclusions are:

It is recommended that Back Lane be reduced for a lower limit of 30/40mph subject to further consultation.

The existing limit on Bilton Lane is to remain with improvements considered at the series of bends between Holmefield Farm and Bilton.

Proposed Traffic Signals, Sheaf and Sickle Junction – The consultation end-date was confirmed as having been extended to 12th September to accommodate the Parish Council’s meeting cycle. To date, responses received have been quite varied, from support to criticism as unnecessary. Once the end-date has passed, officers will draw up an analysis of all responses and suggest a way forward. The present choices will be boiled down to a single proposal and that will be re-consulted upon. A final County Council decision will then be made in the light of that second consultation. Time is running short for spending the Section 106 money on this scheme, so all this work will be progressed just as quickly as possible. The Chairman Cllr. Mr Draper moved to bring forward Agenda Item 8.A.4) - Proposed Traffic Signals with Pedestrian facilities (Sheaf & Sickle Junction) as this was now being discussed. A Parishioner enquired why all the facts and figures, the junction should be viewed and any decision suspended until the Western Relief Road is finished, an assessment should then be done. Anything done now could make the junction worse. The reply to which was that nothing was confirmed and only proposals were currently being looked at following a 3 month period of consultation. Cllr. Mrs Watson enquired how wide the circulation list had been for consulting as she had not been consulted. Cllr. Mr Draper informed that he had consulted with local residents and had spent 2 hrs from 7.15-9.15am, peak time, counting the number of cars queuing at the junction. In Back Lane the most queuing was 3, Rugby Road was 3, at Bilton Lane the numbers were 14, 10 and 8. The net effect was that no-one was waiting more than 1 minute. This was traffic heading towards Coventry. There was one incident coming the other way which involved a Camex lorry which was following a cyclist. However, it was pointed out that the blind corner at the Sheaf & Sickle appeared to be a problem with lorries on the Road unloading beer. It was commented that it should be reviewed when the Relief Road was completed. However, on the Rugby Road side (East Side) it was commented that a cross hatch junction with pedestrian traffic lights could be implemented and the rest of the 106 money be used to improve the footways. County Cllr. Mr Hodkinson commented there would be nothing to rule out this solution. It was further reported that some 7/8 years ago the Brewery had been asked not to deliver on the Rugby Road at peak
times. It was commented that delivery should be made from the car park and the road needed triple yellow lines to stop loading and unloading. The question of whether the 106 money was set aside for a specific purpose was asked and the time limit for spending was also mentioned. Cllr. Mrs Watson confirmed that the deadline, including the Cawston Development part of the 106 monies, was 2010. It was commented that there was no point in spending money just because it needs spending. A parishioner commented that no decisions should be made on such an important issue without having all the relevant facts; this was seconded by another member of the public. It was also commented that the Western Relief Road would not make a great deal of difference to the junction. It was felt that it was difficult to speculate on what will happen and that it could be reviewed later on. The question was asked why the Traffic Lights had been pursued for three years if they were not wanted.

Standing Orders were re-instated

The questions raised in the consultation process were then addressed, agenda item 8.A.i):
2. Are you in favour of the Proposed Traffic Signal Junction as shown on drawing SIG/345/01/A3: NO
2. Any other comments relating to this scheme: At all times traffic must be able to turn in all directions

The above answers to 1. and 2. was proposed and seconded with 5 votes in favour and 3 abstentions.

Borough Councillors Mrs Watson and Mrs Bragg:
Antisocial Behaviour – Despite the bad summer rowdiness and general nuisance incidents are higher but criminal damage and arson incidents both across the County and in Long Lawford are lower.
Cllr. Mrs Watson has secured the garage site behind the Holbrook Road shops along with the alleyway towards Boyce Way and the basket ball pitch as a pilot scheme, for when some of the garages are demolished. At the moment there is no clear plan for the area but Councillors are looking into ways of securing the whole area whilst allowing access for local residents.

Rugby Station – Cllr. Mrs Watson and Cllr. Mrs Bragg both attended a presentation by Arup, giving details of the new car park to be sited on the Mill road side of the Station (i.e. behind the station). It will provide 300 spaces, making 770 spaces around the Station. It will achieve accreditation so reaching safe parking standards. The required electricity supply will be partially sourced from 2 wind turbines 12m above the top floor.

Earl Craven Locality Panel – The next meeting on 18th September will be held in the new Village Hall in Church Lawford at 7.30pm. However, from 6.30pm there will be a drop in session for information on the Future of Rugby Consultation and a police surgery for local issues.

Abandoned Vehicle – There has been a black vehicle parked on the grass verge opposite the bus stop on the A428 by the Green for several months. Cllr. Mrs Bragg has reported this and the vehicle is to be removed this coming weekend.

County Councillor Mr Hodkinson and Borough Councillor Mrs Bragg left the meeting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>08-09/08</th>
<th>To Receive Reports From:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A) Finance Management and Administration Panel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Standards Board – Cllr. Mr Draper made reference to a document which had been circulated to all Councillors prior to this meeting in which views were required on determination by Local Standards Committee Alleged Breaches of Code of Conduct</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and at the same time referred to a complaint which had been made against him and talked of a private letter which he had sent to Cllr. Mrs Wyatt of which all Councilors had now received a copy. He informed that he would be reading out a statement prepared by himself after which he intended to hand the Chair over to the Vice-Chair as he had a personal interest in the matter. He informed that he would then leave the room whilst the Council discussed the matter further. The following statement was read out by Cllr. Mr Draper:

"To assist in providing the views required and having had direct experience of the Standards Board Alleged Breaches of Code of Conduct procedure I thought the Council should know what has happened concerning the complaints received by the Standards Committee of Rugby Borough Council from a Mrs LP against me. Initially in June she made 8 complaints with 7 subdivisions. In July she then made a further 2 complaints. Only one subdivision of one of the first complaints has been referred by the local Assessment Sub Committee to the Standards Board for England and this is because "in the light of the complainant's extensive previous history with the Borough Council, the Sub-Committee considered that any investigation commissioned by the Monitoring Officer would not be seen by the complainant as being impartial". I have been advised that the investigation by the Standards Board of England may take up to 6 months.

As a Chartered Engineer and Fellow of the Institution of Electrical Engineers and former Chief Engineer and Division Manager of local GEC companies I had the privilege of being responsible for large electrical drives equipment for schemes such as Steel Rolling Mills, Mine Winders, Ocean Liners and a large Irrigation System in Romania. I am therefore used to a climate of getting things done. I have difficulty in understanding the motives of people who seem to see their mission in life as hindering those who wish to get things done. I have considerable experience in chairing meetings and find the allegations by Mrs LP quite preposterous.

I appreciate the unanimous support I have had from Councillors especially for the private letter I sent to Cllr. Wyatt and your condemnation of her action in passing this to a third party without my consent. I normally include Councillors in the group of people who like to get things done. Unfortunately Cllr. Wyatt is no longer in this group. Perhaps we should not be surprised because she usually either votes against or abstains from everything the Council does.

This complaint process is taking up a considerable amount of time of both the Clerk and me and diverting attention from the normal business of the Council. I regret to say that I believe much of the responsibility for this situation is due to Cllr. Wyatt not heeding requests I made in my letter and for supporting and encouraging Mrs LP. She has also recently been making unreasonable requests on the Clerk.

I do not think the current situation should be allowed to continue. I believe this has now become a matter which concerns the whole Council and I should like your guidance about what to do. Options could include a vote of censure on Cllr. Wyatt, requesting a written apology for her actions and confirmation that she will adhere to the requests made in my letter. Alternatively you may propose that I should step down, which should mean at least some of these time wasting problems should stop.

I propose to hand over to the Vice-Chairman and leave the meeting but before doing so I believe we can provide the views required in answer to the questions posed.

1. Does you Council favour a local determination regime over a national one.
   YES

2. Does your Council feel sufficiently informed (by the Standards Board, Monitoring officers
3. Has your Council indemnified its members from legal costs arising from defending an allegation in respect of breaching the Code?
   NO

4. Does it intend to indemnify its members:
   YES but only on the basis that the indemnity covers all actions.

5. Other Comments:
   a) The whole complaints system is slanted in favour of the complainant. The Local Assessment Sub Committee makes decisions without reference to the accused and indeed the accused is unaware of the nature of the complaint until receipt of the Decision Notice. This is clearly wrong and leads to mistakes being made.
   b) The complaint system needs to include a mechanism for discouraging time wasters and vexatious litigants and also a means of redress and compensation for unnecessary distress caused to the wrongly accused.

Cllr. Mr Draper left the room and the Vice-Chairman took the Chair.

It was proposed by Cllr. Mrs Watson, seconded by Cllr. Mrs Slack and agreed by all Councillors, except Cllr. Mrs Wyatt who abstained, to submit the above answers/views, as requested, to the Warwickshire and West Midlands Association of Local Councils.

The Clerk was then requested to read the letter which had been sent by Cllr. Mr Draper to Cllr. Mrs Wyatt. Various comments relating to the contents of the letter were then made; that it was unacceptable to pass on private e-mail addresses without consent from an individual, it was agreed that time was wasted by individuals raising trivial matters. It was noted that the public and press cannot be excluded without cause from a meeting and that there are ways of preventing perpetual nuisance being caused by someone in the rules of the standing orders. Cllr. Mr Davison commented that what was meant by the statement "if she comes again I shall have to request that she be escorted from the building" was that which would have happened if once again trouble and disruption was caused by that person. It was further noted that this person had been disruptive at previous meetings. It was felt by one Councillor that the inference was to dissuade someone from attending a meeting and the comment was made that the Council cannot ban anybody, but part of the rules of standing orders allowed for disruptive members to be escorted away. It was generally felt that there needs to be more effort to hold meetings professionally and to keep matters brief and concise. It was confirmed that since the letter had now been made public, all Councillors had been sent a copy for their records. General comments from Councillors were that Cllr. Mr Draper was a good Chairman and supported entirely to remain as Chairman. It was proposed by Cllr. Mrs Clark to retain Cllr. Mr Draper as Chairman, seconded by Cllr. Mr Rye and agreed by all, except Cllr. Mrs Wyatt who abstained. Cllr. Mr Davison asked if anyone else wished to comment. Cllr. Mrs Clark requested a further copy of the letter. No further comments.

The Vice-Chairman invited Cllr. Mr Draper to return to the room and take over the Chair.

b) Standing Orders Review – At the Finance and Admin. meeting held on 14th July 08, it was discussed and agreed to ask the Council to consider amending the current Standing Orders to include the following:

To add in after clause 23 of the current standing orders of the Parish Council, a
Clause 24:
At all meetings of the Council the Chairman may, at his discretion, and at the commencement of the meeting:

a. Allow any member of the public to address the meeting in relation to the business to be transacted at that meeting or to raise individual matters of concern relating to the Parish.
b. The time period for public participation will be limited to a maximum of 20 minutes with individual contributions limited to 2 minutes.
c. Priority will be given to residents of the Parish.

Cllr. Mr Conroy-Hargreaves commented that this would only allow 10 people to speak if it were to be strictly implemented. Cllr. Mr Draper reported that it would be at the discretion of the Chairman. Cllr. Mrs Lock believed that 2 minutes for individual contributions was not enough. Cllr. Mrs Clark agreed that 2 minutes was not long enough. Cllr. Mrs Watson recommended that "at the discretion of the Chairman" should be highlighted in bold and a further comment at the end of point b. above be added "depending on the complexity of the issue. Cllr. Mr Draper suggested that a maximum of 30 minutes be included instead of 20. Cllr. Mrs Watson suggested that to public present at a meeting be asked in advance for topics to note in order to be aware in advance what topics the public wish to speak about. Cllr. Mrs Wyatt felt that amendment c. was discriminating. Cllr. Mr Draper informed that amendment c. was for the purpose of allowing parishioners to speak first when time was an issue.

It was proposed by Cllr. Mrs Clark, seconded by Cllr. Mrs Lock and agreed by all to implement the changes in the Standing Orders to include Cllr. Mrs Watson recommended wording "at the discretion of the Chairman" in bold and to add the further comment at the end of point b. depending on the complexity of the issue. Also, to extend the length of time allowed to a maximum of 30 minutes.

c) Litter Clearance Pilot Scheme – Cllr. Mr Draper explained the scheme which was to identify areas which need to be highlighted for litter clearance. Cllrs. can contact Cllr. Mrs Watson or Cllr. Mr Draper, or can contact Andy Walsh at RBC direct. Current hotspots which have been reported are – Holbrook Road shops, Prentice Close, Ashman Avenue, Townsend Lane (in front of the Co-op) Bus Stops on the main road, the hard-standing by the bridge on Townsend Lane, Chapel Street and the area coming in to the Village off the A428 into Townsend Lane. Fly-tipping at Lawford Heath was also highlighted.

d) Roundabout Parish Magazine – Request for a Grant towards publishing – The matter was generally discussed when it was proposed, seconded and agreed by all to grant the request for support in the sum of £100.

e) Graffiti Clean-up campaigns brochure and Prices – The Clerk informed that it was now possible to purchase graffiti removal kits which can safely remove small amounts of graffiti. It was proposed, seconded and agreed by all to ask the Clerk to use petty cash to purchase a kit.

f) Proposed Traffic Signals with Pedestrian Facilities (Sheaf & Sickle Junction) – Proposed and discussed at 08/09/07 above.

g) Proposed CCTV Network for Rural Communities – Cllr. Mrs Watson explained the idea/system behind the proposal. Cllr. Mr Draper commented that having spoken with P. Collett from WCC, there was a favourable report and costings. It was proposed to ask for further information about the proposal. Cllr. Mrs Wyatt commented that the Parish Council had already had a demonstration of CCTV and
didn't agree. Cllr. Mr Cleton was not in agreement with the idea. Cllr. Mrs Watson explained that this proposal was a totally different proposition and used different equipment to that which had been demonstrated previously. This current equipment was being trialled and more information would be sought about the trial outcome etc.

h) WCC Chairman's at home reception – Cllrs. were asked who would like to attend. Cllrs. Mr Conroy-Hargreaves and Cllr. Mrs Watson expressed interest in attending. The Clerk was requested to reply to the invitation on their behalf.

i) Traffic Calming Measures – Railway Bridge & Townsend Lane – Cllr. Mrs Watson informed that she had put something about this matter in an e-mail direct to RBC.

j) Request by Mrs L Pallikaropoulos to Carol Bradford RBC for Minutes of Long Lawford PC Meetings – The matter was discussed and it was proposed by Cllr. Mrs Watson, seconded by Cllr. Mrs Slack and agreed by all except Cllr. Mrs Clark who abstained to refuse to allow Carol Bradford RBC to release copies of minutes which she holds as monitoring officer to Mrs L Pallikaropoulos. If copies are requested, the Clerk should be contacted directly where charges can be applied.

Cllr. Chairman Mr Draper moved to change the order of the Agenda items, due to the lateness of the meeting. It was decided that items 9 and 10 be dealt with at this point.

To received Details of Financial Matters

a) Accounts for Payment August & September 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>CHQ NO.</th>
<th>ISSUED TO</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>1634</td>
<td>Severn Trent Water (Pavilion)</td>
<td>£52.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>1635</td>
<td>E.On ST Lighting (Apr-June 08)</td>
<td>£1,256.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>1636</td>
<td>Veolia Grounds Maint. (Apr-June 08)</td>
<td>£1,664.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.9.08</td>
<td>1637/38/39/40 Confidential</td>
<td>£1,093.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.9.08</td>
<td>1641</td>
<td>LL Primary School (Newsletter Printing)</td>
<td>£101.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.9.08</td>
<td>1642</td>
<td>Clement Keys (External Audit 08)</td>
<td>£470.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.9.08</td>
<td>1643</td>
<td>Wickstead Leisure (Roundabout L/H)</td>
<td>£11,045.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.9.08</td>
<td>1644</td>
<td>Telecoms Sept 08</td>
<td>£23.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.9.08</td>
<td>1645</td>
<td>Petty Cash Vouchers 74-80</td>
<td>£141.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.9.08</td>
<td>1646</td>
<td>HMRC NI due September 08</td>
<td>£64.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.9.08</td>
<td>1647</td>
<td>E.On Pavilion Elec. June-Sept 08</td>
<td>Canc Cheque</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.9.08</td>
<td>1648</td>
<td>E.On Pavilion Elec. June-Sept 08</td>
<td>£29.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total August &amp; September 08 Payments</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.7.08 Cons. Dividend £1.29
26.8.08 Boughton Leigh Charities Roundabout L/H £9,550.00

**Total Incomings July & August 08** £9,551.29

Bank Balance as at 29th August 08 = £25,593.58

It was proposed by Cllr. Mr Rye, seconded by Cllr. Mrs Clark and agreed by all to accept the accounts for payment.

b) Bank Reconciliation – Cllr. Mr Draper confirmed that a Finance & Admin. meeting had taken place and that the Bank Reconciliation had been looked at and approved.
c) Effectiveness of Internal Audit approval – The Clerk referred to the effectiveness of internal audit document which had been circulated to all Councillors in July 08. It was proposed by Cllr. Mrs Clark, seconded by Cllr. Mrs Lock and approved by all, except Cllr. Mrs Wyatt, to accept the document as being effective in allowing the Internal Audit to be carried out in line with current legislation.

d) Annual Return submission to Charities Commission for King George’s Field – The Clerk reported that the annual return had been submitted for year ending 08.

e) Clement Keys – External Auditors – The Clerk reported having received the Statement of Accounts and Certificate returned from the External Auditors with no comments or areas of concern highlighted. The closure of the Audit to be advertised on the Notice Board.

DG

08-09/10

To Receive Details of Planning Matters

1. R08/1071/PLN – Installation of a 7.3m diameter antenna within existing cluster of satellite dishes. Satellite Media Services, Earth Station, Lawford Heath Lane, Long Lawford.

2. R410/08CM027 – Retention of weighbridge ticket kiosk for improved monitoring of inbound and outbound HGV’s carrying raw materials at entrance access to Rugby Cement Works. Cement tankers are loaded/monitored elsewhere on site. Rugby Cement Works, Lawford Road, Rugby.

Planning Decisions:

1. R08/0715/PLN – Installation of a 0.74m satellite dish. Long Lawford Store, 5 Holbrook Road, Long Lawford, Rugby

Rugby Borough Council has refused the above planning application.

2. R08/0838/HOUS – Erection of an extension to the existing garage and provision of a pitched roof over the existing front dormer.

18 Livingston Avenue, Long Lawford, Rugby

Rugby Borough Council has approved the above planning application.

The Chairman moved to carry-over the remaining business on the Agenda, namely items; 8.B, C, D and items 11 and 12 due to the lateness of the meeting. This was proposed, seconded and agreed by all.

08-09/13

Date and Time of the Next Meeting

Cllr. Mr Draper thanked everyone for attending and confirmed that the next meeting was due to take place on Tuesday 14th October at 7.30 pm in the Memorial Hall, Long Lawford.

The Meeting was declared closed at 10.10pm

Signed: 

Date: 14/10/08

Mr D Draper, Chairman
MINUTES OF THE LONG LAWFORD PARISH COUNCIL MEETING HELD ON TUESDAY
8th July 2008 IN THE MEMORIAL HALL, RAILWAY STREET, LONG LAWFORD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Present:</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cllr. Mr D Draper</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miss D Groves</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr. M Davison</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr. E Clark</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr. M Conroy-Hargreaves</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borough Cllr. Mrs S. Bragg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr. Mr K. Rye</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr. Mrs S. Lock</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr. Mrs C. Watson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr. Mrs J Slack</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr. Mrs P Wyatt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Cllr. Mr D Hodkinson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minute</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08-07/01 Opening of Meeting and Apologies for Absence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairman Cllr. Mr Draper welcomed everyone and opened the meeting at 7.30pm. Cllr. Draper outlined the handling of Parish Council meetings. Main part of the meeting is undertaken whereby standing orders are instated and decisions are taken by Councillors alone. A Councillor has three minutes to make a proposal on a subject and each Councillor can speak once on that particular proposal for 2 minutes only. Standing Orders are suspended when the public are invited to speak/participate purposes of which are to:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Raise matters/Incidents in the Parish – principally for Parish members.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Contribute to what is on the Agenda and to ask Councillors to be aware of their views when considering that item.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standing Orders, at present do not cover public participation and will be discussed/agreed shortly with a view to making a fair arrangement for the public to speak but with a specific time limit, for eg. 20 minutes overall, with a 2 minute individual contribution, Parish members having priority. At present it is at the discretion of the Chairman.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC DG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minute</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08-07/02 To Receive Police Report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCSO Simon Thomas passed a copy of the Police Report to all Councillors and briefly outlined the incidents therein. It was reported that mainly due to the weather, there had been an increase in rowdy behaviour. Criminal damage had increased, 2 fires and theft of 2 vehicles had been dealt with. Most of the incidents had occurred the weekend of the 28th and 29th June. Cllr. Draper enquired if any were particularly serious. It was reported that one of the fires was linked to a stolen Moped. Cllr. Mrs Wyatt asked if any arrests had been made. None had been made; there is no CCTV available, but house to house enquiries currently taking place. Cllr. Cleton pointed out that the fire outside of the British Legion had been reported but that the Police had not attended. The burnt out vehicle had been leaned against the door of the club and had significantly burned the door. He further pointed out that a bike or bikes had been riding up and down the streets for about 3 hours prior to the fire incident. PCSO Thomas informed that the bike had been taken away but that no details could be obtained from the bike as it was too badly damaged. Cllr. Draper enquired if there had been any witnesses. PCSO replied that it cannot be assumed that the burnt out bike and the riding around the streets were one and the same incident.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr. Mrs Watson talked of the football being played in Ashman Avenue where youths had been moved onto the road away from the grassed area. It was noted that they should be playing in the Recreation fields. Some of the smaller children were not really a problem. Known older individuals were getting involved in the playing of football in the area and it is one particular resident who is calling in to complain more than others.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr. Draper welcomed Paul Collett from WCC. He thanked the Council for the invite and went on to report progress regarding the problem of mopeds using Holbrook Road, Boyce Way. Site visits had taken place with RBC and WCC. As a result, no objections have been raised to putting in place the &quot;S&quot; shaped metal fencing. Quotes had been received to extend 34 across from the School to the Garages and to place another further down towards Boyce Way. This would not restrict double buggies, pushchairs etc. from being able to pass. There is an intention to place additional signage in the area at either end. There is currently a plan to proceed with an</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
envisaged active plan completed and in place by September. Mr Collett moved on to the relocation of the fencing around the basketball court. The project is a little more complicated and may take a little longer to complete. There is an intention to proceed, however. A quote has been received for completing the works. Mr Collett felt that it should be pushed ahead. Residents were encouraged to continue to report incidents in the area. Long Lawford Anti-Social Group, due to meet on Wednesday 9th July, it would be discussed further at that meeting. After the Parish Council recess, plans would be produced. Cllr. Mr Draper noted that he would like to see a formal plan. Mr Collett intended to speak with the Holbrook Road shop owners and the residents of Boyce Way. In September, there would be proper formal plans proposed. Cllr. Mrs Wyatt asked for further clarification at the 9th September PC meeting. Mr Collett reported that during the past week there had been a site visit to look at some of the garages in the area and thought that there may be some movement on plans to take some of them down. He asked the PC to consider what they might like to see in place of the garages. Cllr. Mrs Watson informed that there was a meeting in September with all the different agencies and that she would come back to the PC with ideas. Cllr. Mrs Wyatt enquired whether installation of the "S" gates would have any impact on the possible changes to the garages. It was confirmed that there would be no impact.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mr P Collett</th>
<th>CW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| 08-07-03   |   |

To Invite Members of the Public to Speak on Matters of Concern

There were four members of the public present.

Mrs Partington-Teamey, on behalf of herself and other residents, had three issues to bring to the attention of the PC:

1. It was requested that another no-smoking sign be erected in the Bus Shelter by the Community Centre.

2. It was requested if the PC could do anything about the 40 plus white doves which were mating with wild pigeons and attending gardens in clusters taking food intended for wild birds. It was reported that there was a problem with bird droppings making the ground slippery. Properties in the Spinney and Round Avenue were particularly affected. Residents had contacted the National Pigeon Association who had informed that they could catch and cul the birds or catch and relocate them 5 miles away. This would cost money and as the owners of the original 4 white doves from Sunrise had passed away, no-one was in control. The Parish Council was asked to consider using Council Tax Payers money to pay to get rid of the birds. Cllr. Mr Draper asked whether the Borough Council had been contacted. Cllr. Mrs Watson informed that it was beyond the remit of the Borough and that the owners of Sunrise owned the problem, unless the birds were completely wild, which these birds aren’t classed as being. Cllr. Mrs Watson further reported that the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds were unable to do anything in case there were any complaints from the owners of the birds. I.e. The new owners of the property, Sunrise. Cllr. Draper enquired who the new owners were. It was reported that probate was not yet completed. Cllr. Mrs Watson commented that they were semi-wild and were not healthy. Mrs Partington-Teamey thought that they were a health hazard. Cllr. Mrs Watson suggested that the relatives should be contacted, and informed how much it would cost to round them up. The Clerk was requested to obtain a quote from the National Pigeon Association.

3. It was reported that there was bad feeling about the location of the proposed Play Equipment for the King George’s Field and it was suggested that the equipment was moved to the bottom end of the field near the basketball court. If placed where suggested, what would happen to the small football posts? Cllr. Mrs Watson informed that they would have, in their place, a large pitch to play on.

4. Mrs Partington-Teamey requested that Minutes of the previous meeting be available to the public.

Mrs Lorraine Thomas, a resident from Back Lane informed of her concern regarding sewerage flowing from Tee Tong Road across Back Lane, some five weeks ago. Cllr. Mrs Wyatt and Borough Councillors had been informed of the incident. It was reported that 10 years ago, Severn Trent had reported that there wasn’t the capacity to have another house connected to
the current system. Since then another 180 houses have been built. What will happen if raw
ersewage spills into homes? It was reported that Severn Trent won't adopt the Tee Tong
Development because of problems. In the latest incident people were pushing pushchairs
through the raw sewage from Townsend Lane all the way down to the Sheaf and Sickle Pub,
unaware of the content. Mrs Thomas requested that the Parish Council take it to task and get it
in hand. Cllr. Draper informed that the Parish Council had been opposed to the development in
the beginning and committed to investigating the problem. Mrs Thomas further informed that with
everyone at home at the weekend, Pims Pumps (who were contracted to maintain the pump
station) can take up to 4/5 hours to get out to re-set the pump when there is a problem. Severn
Trent is not liable for taking the sewage away neither to sanitise the area after a spill. The
pumping station is owned by Bloores and pay Pims Pumps to maintain it. Cllr. Draper further re-
iterated that it will be investigated further.

Mrs Thomas expressed a concern about the co-incinerator for the Cemex works. Cllr. Draper
informed that if when a planning application is received for a co-incinerator, it would be placed
on the Agenda for discussion and residents would have the opportunity to raise concerns if when
that occurs.

Mrs Theresa Taylor, a resident from Prentice Close informed that her 8 year old Son had been
knocked off his bike in Ashman Avenue recently by a white van. She requested that the Parish
Council consider requesting speed humps be placed in the area of Holbrook Road/Ashman
Avenue. Cllr. Mr Draper informed that discussions were currently taking place regarding speed
humps in the Parish and that her concerns would be taken into consideration.

Mrs Lilian Palikaropoulos was pleased to note that the Chairman had outlined the ability to
suspend standing orders and allow the public to speak on planning matters. Cllr. Draper re-
iterated that the public would be allowed to speak on planning matters that were listed on the
Agenda only. Mrs Palikaropoulos requested that Minutes/Agendas be available at meetings. It
was further commented that draft minutes should not be made available to the press. Cllr.
Draper informed that the minutes were made draft minutes but were in fact minutes of the meeting
and that both RBC and WCC published minutes of meetings before they are approved on the
Website for the public to view. PC minutes are approved at the next meeting and any
amendments are minuted for publication also.

Standing Orders were Instated
Cllr. Mrs Wyatt passed round a note to Councillors proposing correction to the Minutes of 10th
June. (Doc No 13)

08-07/04 To Receive Declarations of Personal or Other Interest
Cllr. Mrs Watson declared a personal interest in matters relating to Warwickshire County Council
(a family member is a County Councillor). Cllr. Mrs Wyatt declared a personal interest in matters
relating to Livingstone Avenue, any matters relating to Boughton Charities and any matters
relating to Rugby in Pimlico.

08-07/05 To Approve the Minutes of the Meeting held on Tuesday 10th June 2008.
Due to the Clerk/Chairman having received warnings of legal action from a member of the
public, the Chairman on a point of confidentiality requested that members of the public leave the
meeting whilst the Minutes were discussed. Cllr. Draper spoke of the note received from Cllr.
Mrs Wyatt referred to above and asked if anyone supported the views contained therein with
reference to Minute No. 08/06/03 of 10th June 2008. No comments or replies were made by
anyone. Cllr. Mrs Wyatt requested to know why members of the public’s names had been used
in the Minutes. Cllr. Mrs Watson commented that there was nothing in the standing orders to
stop names being used. Cllr Draper therefore proposed moving on to the accuracy of the rest of
the Minutes from 10th June 2008.

Cllr. Mrs Watson informed that at 08/06/06 Bev Tedds and perminder Rai were Borough Council
Community Wardens and not PCSO’s.
Cllr. Mrs Wyatt - that at item 08-06/05 and with reference to item 08-05/16 from the 13th May
Minutes “insert” for the benefit of the non English speaking members of the parish.
It was suggested that members of the public be invited to return to the meeting.
Cllr. Mrs Bragg - at 08-06-08, point 5, to insert "member of the Foundation Trust, as they are wanting to increase numbers.

Cllr. Mrs Watson - at 08-05-07 that the following be added: Cllr. Mr Davison had proposed moving forward with the current layout, no-one seconded the proposal. Cllr. Draper agreed to the Play & Leisure Group looking at it again.

At 8.30pm Cllr. Mrs Wyatt, without comment, left the meeting and returned with members of the public.

Cllr. Mrs Watson - at 08-06-08, point 2, attended a presentation by Cemex "insert" on the proposed mechanical biological treatment plant at Malpass Farm.

Cllr. Mrs Watson - at 08-06-08, point 3 "insert" after workshop - RBC had strategies ...

Cllr. Mrs Watson - at 08-06-08, point 6, "insert" after Committee in Warwick.

Cllr. Mrs Watson - at 08-06-12, last paragraph - "after" Parish Newsletter would be produced.

Cllr Mrs Watson informed "insert" before 26th July and "add" - Fete Day.

It was proposed by Cllr. Mr Davison seconded by Cllr. Mrs Clark (Cllr. Mrs Watson added the comment "accepts the Minutes, with the amendments") and agreed by all other Councillors to accept the Minutes of the 10th June 2008 meeting.

The Clerk requested that Borough Councillors provide a written report for submission to the Parish Council prior to future meetings in order to maintain accuracy. Cllr. Mr Draper agreed that this would be a good idea and requested that this be done. This was agreed by Borough Councillors Mrs Watson and Cllr. Mrs Bragg. Cllr. Mr Hodkinson currently provides written reports.

<p>| 08-07/06 | To Receive Progress Reports on Outstanding Items Not Covered Later on the Agenda | SB |
| 08-07/07 | To Receive Reports From: | DG |
| A) Management and Administration Panel |  |
| a) Traffic Calming Measures – Railway Bridge &amp; Townsend Lane – Cllr. Mrs Watson reported that she had had no time to review this issue and put anything in writing but will endeavour to do this. | CW |
| b) Speed of Traffic A428 Rugby Road – Cllr Draper informed that he had been in touch with Speed Aware and was advised that the area does not qualify for permanent signs due to no reports of personal injury being received during the past three years. We are entitled to x8 frequency of fixed flashing temporary signs. The next occasion for installation of a temporary sign will be 13th October and this will be in place for three weeks. Cllr. Mrs Wyatt enquired where the sign would be sited. Cllr. Draper had not been informed exactly where. | DG |
| c) Bus Stops Back Lane – Cllr. Mr Hodkinson confirmed that it had been agreed to reposition the Bus Stop/Pole, there had been a site visit. It will be incorporated into the plans for the traffic lights. | MCH |
| d) Proposal to increase Admission Number of Harris School – Cllr. Mr Conroy-Hargreaves requested to look at the proposal. Cllr. Draper thought this was a good idea as his background covered being a Governor of a School. It was confirmed that the Area Committee has given its support. Cllr. Mrs Wyatt requested that any views which were proposed to be made by the Parish Council be provided to her beforehand as she would want to be a part of it. Cllr. Draper suggested that if Cllr. Conroy-Hargreaves had any comments to make, a copy would be circulated to all Councillors to add their own comments, should they wish. Cllr. Mrs Watson felt that Cllr. Mr Conroy-Hargreaves, as a Teacher, was the right person to look at the proposal. | P&amp;L Group |
| e) Parish Capital Spending Fund – The Play &amp; Leisure Group were asked to look at and prepare a case for funding for the Sports Pavilion from this fund, in time for next year. |  |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>f) Review of the Effectiveness of Internal Audit – The Clerk informed of the need for the Parish Council to review this document, which had been circulated with the Agenda to allow the time to review it prior to the meeting. It was further pointed out that it was necessary to carry out this review in time for the external Auditors deadline of 21st July 2008. Cllr Mrs Watson suggested that this be looked at by the Finance and Management Committee meeting at its next meeting. Cllr Mr Draper agreed to look at it at that time as there was a meeting scheduled for 14th July.</td>
<td>Fin Manage Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Chairman’s Honorarium 07/08 – Chairman, Cllr. Mr Draper was requested to leave the room whilst this item was discussed. Cllr. Mrs Wyatt enquired whether it had been proposed to increase the Honorarium payment of £150 from last year. It was confirmed by the Clerk that no proposal had been received. The purpose of the honorarium was questioned. Cllr. Mrs Watson explained that it was for out of pocket expenses incurred for carrying out the duties of Chairman, e.g. attending meetings, telephone expenses etc. etc. Cllr. Mrs Wyatt proposed that the Chairman be paid an Honorarium at the same rate as last year, the Clerk confirmed that this was £150, seconded by Cllr. Mrs Watson and agreed by all.</td>
<td>DG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Parish Council Strimmer – It was explained by Cllr. Mr Davison that the PC strimmer no longer worked effectively. As the strimmer was some 10 years old Cllr. Mr Draper suggested that it was time for a new one. It was proposed by Cllr. Mrs Watson that a ceiling of £125 be used to purchase a new one, seconded by Cllr. Mrs Slack and agreed by all.</td>
<td>DG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B) Recreation Grounds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Cllr. Mrs Watson reported that there was to be a further presentation of the proposed play equipment for the King George’s Field to take place at the Fete on the 26th July. Volunteers for the stall were requested. Cllr. Mr Davison would try to be there. Cllr. Mrs Slack apologised for being unable to attend as she would be on holiday. Cllr. Mr Draper informed that he would be available to fit in at some point. Cllr. Mrs Wyatt offered to help if she is here. Cllr. Mrs Watson agreed to organise a rota for the day. Cllr. Mrs Watson requested the key for upstairs to the Memorial Hall. The Clerk informed that the key was available for collection when it was needed.</td>
<td>CW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Cllr. Mr Cleton reported that the Spring Rocker in the Top Field is very loose in the ground. The Clerk informed that the Handyman was aware of the problem and would be concreting it back in as soon as possible.</td>
<td>DG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) It was further pointed out that the rubber sleeve which hangs down from the chain at the top of the mechanism on the tyre play in the top field had been ripped off. The Clerk was requested to ask the handyman to take a look at it to see if he can repair it, failing which Red Egg be contacted to obtain a quote to replace it. Post meeting note: Handyman has suggested that the purpose of the rubber sleeve, in his opinion was to protect the mechanism from the weather. Chairman informed.</td>
<td>DG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Cllr. Mr Cleton reported the breaking up of the safety surface underneath the tyre play equipment in the top field. Cllr. Mrs Watson agreed to ask someone from the Borough to come and take a look at it in the first instance to try to ascertain what could be done and how much it is likely to cost.</td>
<td>CW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C) Play and Leisure Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) 106 Agreement Monies (P&amp;L Group) – Cllr. Mrs Watson produced amended plans which showed the relocation of the various equipment proposed. This new layout was decided by the Play and Leisure Group to be the best plan available to the Parish Council. Cllr. Mr Davison enquired whether this new layout would still allow the 30 metre boundary to the nearest property boundary. It was confirmed that it would. It was further pointed out by Cllr. Mrs Watson that the swings and climbing frame had been placed giving a 20 metre boundary from the park and not buildings. Cllr. Mrs Wyatt enquired</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
whether the new layout takes the football pitch into consideration. Cllr. Mrs Watson stated that the new layout took the equipment further away from the football pitch. Cllr. Mrs Wyatt replied that this would be better for ball playing and the direction of the agoraspacce gave a better first impression in her opinion. Cllr. Mr Draper informed that 20 people had attended the exhibition held in the memorial hall, of which 9 were in favour of the plans, 5 were against (due to worry of noise mainly but included the worry that youths will abuse the equipment and it will be expensive to maintain it), 6 further residents made no comments. Cllr. Mrs Watson reported that due to uncontrollable dogs being allowed off lead in the park there was a concern regarding the openness of the all weather pitch. She suggested that bigger and more signs would be needed and legislation should soon be available for the Parish Council to have more power to impose fines etc. if dogs continued to be allowed to run loose. Cllr. Mr Draper reported that damage to play equipment was more likely to be created at night time. Cllr. Mrs Clark, referring to noise levels, asked about the possibility of closing it at night times. Cllr. Mrs Watson replied that it would not be possible to close it and that problems with noise were less likely to occur as had happened at Ryton due to Ryton having a chain link fence and noise was created by the ball hitting the fence. This all weather pitch was made of wood and therefore less likely to be noisy. Cllr. Mr Draper enquired about progress with the RBC 106 Officer to discuss matters. Cllr. Mrs Watson has been unable to arrange a meeting yet, but will endeavour to do so soon.

D) Transport, Highways, Drains and Street Lighting

a) Cllr. Mrs Wyatt asked whether we needed to ask BC Mrs Bragg to follow up on the drains in Back Lane. Cllr. Mr Draper agreed that the problem did need following up. Cllr. Mrs Wyatt asked whether the proposed new houses off Townsend Lane and the Davis houses were proposed to be connected into the same pipe work. Cllr. Mr Draper agreed to follow this up.

b) Cllr. Mr Draper confirmed that he had been in contact with WCC regarding the North end of Lawford Heath Lane and had reported the ruts either side of the Lane and the inconsistent width of the road all along the Lane. He reported that WCC had confirmed that white lines were due to be painted all along Lawford Heath Lane.

c) Cllr. Mrs Slack reported that Rd/Direction signs at the Bridge by Church Lawford were obscured due to the growth of the hedgerows and overgrown trees covering the signs. Cllr. Mrs Bragg reported that she would be raising the issue at the Church Lawford Parish Council meeting and that an officer from the County would be attending to hear the concerns of the residents. This to include the high lorry’s by the bridge.

d) Cllr. Mrs Wyatt reported replying to the Environment Agency regarding their request for private comments vis-à-vis litter on A&B roads in the area. Cllr. Mr Draper also reported sending his comments.

e) Cllr. Mr Conroy-Hargreaves reported that Pole No. 7 in Holbrook Road had not been repaired due to WCC waiting for an ignitor from Germany. He further reported that he would be meeting with Kevin from WCC shortly to go out and take a look at and find out more about the lights in the village. Cllr. Mr Clifton reported that Pole No. 2 in Main Street was not working. Cllr. Mr Conroy-Hargreaves to report.

08-07-08

To Receive Borough Councillors Reports

1. Cllr. Mrs Bragg: Locality Panel is a growing success with the Police giving crime figures in a slide show format. Statistics show Rugby is still a safe place to live. Details of a hand held gun for speed awareness were discussed and are controlled by Police. Next meeting is at Church Lawford Village Hall on the 16th September at 7.30pm. Church Lawford Village Hall to be officially opened on 16.7.08 at 8pm. Hall will be available for hire. The Economy panel are carrying out a scrutiny review on travel tokens that the residents of Lawford Heath are currently unable to claim as they are under the umbrella of Long Lawford Parish. Further meetings are to be
held as it is agreed that the present criteria and guidelines are unbalanced. Smart Summer Activities offer a wide range of activities such as trampoline classes and belly dancing. The bus calling at Long Lawford for the Friday swim gives a voucher entitling you to a free further visit to Ken Manford baths and is available for 11 - 16 yr olds. The Council was urged to respond to the consultation on Post Office closures. Civic Service was attended and the sermon discussed the knife amnesty that will be held in Rugby with bins at the Church and Police station. A white pledge board will be outside the church 18-19th July and a pledge to make Rugby safer is invited by the public in return for a free t-shirt. It was also noted that knives could also be placed in household bins. Special Council meeting was held to look at restructuring scrutiny carried out by Councillors enabling us to pursue topics that interest us or affect our ward. RBC's housing stock will be inspected shortly and a mock housing inspection meeting detailing the standards of repair expected was attended. We are aware the verges quality and quantity of cuts have been an issue recently and this was also raised at the joint Borough and Parish Council meeting.

2. Cllr. Mrs Watson: Cllr. Mrs Watson sits on the health overview and scrutiny panel at Warwick, looking at new developments, government strategies, working with the PCT and other agencies. Cllr. Mrs Watson has become involved with the older persons services partnership board, looking at strategies involving care of the older person. A workshop has been attended looking at setting up a 1 stop shop, enabling members of the public to gain all the information they require (Borough, County or Police) through one person. Cllr. Mrs Watson is taking part in a review of the alleygate schemes looking to see whether they have been successful and more needs to be done. There has been a meeting of the Rugby Community Cement Forum, looking at Cemex's proposal to burn more tyres than their present permit allows following recent trials. Future proposals for a possible MBT plant at Malpass Farm will also be looked at. At the recent environment panel meeting a suggestion was put forward to look closely at highway drainage and to monitor air quality in relation to the air quality management area. Environment Health open day attended at Hunter's Lane where examples of the work undertaken by the different departments were seen. The Health and Safety video for safer workings with refuse collecting was viewed. By March a neighbourhood walk of the ward was undertaken and recently a feedback workshop was attended. The message that will go back to officers at both Councils is to communicate better with elected members.

3. County Cllr. Mr Hodkinson: Bilton Lane footpath route choice - C/Cllr. Mr Hodkinson and a design engineer from WCC have met on site two local farmers to gain a better understanding in order to choose a route for the proposed footpath. The outcome was to see more complications and costs pursuing a western than an eastern route. The design engineer has now confirmed the technical acceptability of an eastern footpath. Safety at the A428 junction would also support this choice.

Proposed Traffic Light-controlled junction, A428 - Signals Section are happy with an eastern pedestrian crossing point to match the new Bilton Lane footpath, if requested now.

Back Lane footpath route choice - A meeting has taken place on 30th June with local representatives, there were no engineering objections to a footpath on the eastern side of Back Lane (South from Tea long Road).

In the light of the above, County Councillor Mr Hodkinson informed he would be prepared to support an easternly route for all three if the Parish Council makes a resolution to this effect.
It was resolved to accept the proposals by Cllr Mr Hodkinson above, proposed by Cllr Mrs Watson, seconded by Cllr Mrs Slack and agreed by all except Cllr Mrs Wyatt who commented that she was against the Back Lane proposals.

It was further reported by Cllr Mr Hodkinson that an engineer was examining the case for setting back the kerb on the n-w corner of the Sheaf & Sickle junction that No. 88 buses now repeatedly pass over and flatten further. A further engineer has been asked by Cllr Mr Hodkinson to investigate the introduction of speed limits in both Back Lane and Bilton Lane, for which there appears to be clear local support.

The proposed cycle route at the A428 was at the design stage and plans will be obtained. Cllr Mrs Watson commented that monies were available from the Cawston Development and also needed to be considered.

08-07/09  To received Details of Financial Matters

a) Accounts for Payment July and August 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>CHQ NO.</th>
<th>ISSUED TO</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.7.08</td>
<td>1617/18/19/20/21</td>
<td>Confidential</td>
<td>£1,189.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.7.08</td>
<td>1622</td>
<td>Telecoms</td>
<td>£23.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.7.08</td>
<td>1623</td>
<td>Confidential</td>
<td>£75.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.7.08</td>
<td>1624</td>
<td>HMRC Tax &amp; NI July 08</td>
<td>£118.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.7.08</td>
<td>1625</td>
<td>Petty Cash Vouchers 66-73</td>
<td>£110.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.7.08</td>
<td>1626</td>
<td>Internal Audit Fee 07/08</td>
<td>£211.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.7.08</td>
<td>1627</td>
<td>Training</td>
<td>£30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.7.08</td>
<td>1628/29/30/31</td>
<td>Confidential</td>
<td>£1,039.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.7.08</td>
<td>1632</td>
<td>Telecoms</td>
<td>£23.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.7.08</td>
<td>1633</td>
<td>HMRC Tax &amp; NI August 08</td>
<td>£118.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Outgoings July & August 2008 = £2,938.57
Total Incomings June 2008 = £6,050.86 (Football Fees and VAT 07/08 refund)
Bank Balance as at 30th June 08 = £21,905.80

It was proposed by Cllr Mrs Clark, seconded by Cllr Mr Rye and agreed by all to accept the accounts for payment.

08-07/10  To Receive Details of Planning Matters

1. R05/0135/08787/D – Land off Back Lane, Long Lawford
   Details of Approval: Condition 11, condition 12 (part) Site Compound Area and Details of Leap.

2. R08/0689/HOUS – 6 Chapel Street, Long Lawford.
   Erection of a part two storey, part single storey side and front extensions.
   RBC has approved the above application.

08-07/11  To Receive Items of Correspondence

List of Correspondence to be posted on Notice Board. All Cllrs. have received a separate list.

08-07/12  Councillors Reports and items for Future Agenda

Cllr Mrs Watson produced copy of latest Newsletter and asked for any comments prior to printing. Cllrs. Mrs Clark and Mrs Slack offered to help with the printing.
Cllr Mrs Watson reported that the junior football team requests that the Parish Council pay for 2 storage containers and 1 set of half size goal posts. Legislation states that goal post cornes have to be rounded. The current goal posts have angled cornes. Cllr Mrs Watson informed that she was looking into funding for this from RBC. The Clerk was requested to place the item on CW
the Agenda for 9th September PC meeting. Clrs. Mrs Watson also informed that it will be possible shortly for LLPC to have own village style litter bin with logo.
Clr. Mr Mike Conroy-Hargreaves reported having been asked by members of public at this current meeting if Minutes/Agendas could be made available for public. Clerk informed that she had brought extra copies to the meeting, as usual, but due to Clrs. arriving without their Minutes/Agendas had given them out to Councillors prior to the public being in attendance.
Clir. Mrs Wyatt informed that information could be obtained directly from NALC. Clr. Mrs Wyatt asked why the internal auditors report had not been seen. Clerk reported that the report had been seen by the Finance Committee of which Clr. Mrs Wyatt was a member. It was further reported by the Clerk that Clr. Mrs Wyatt had not attended any of the four Finance Committee meetings which had taken place during the year at each quarter end, the last of which no apologies for absence had been received from Clr. Mrs Wyatt. The contents had been fully discussed and reported back to full Council. Clr. Mrs Wyatt reported the high height of litter at Ling Hall Quarry. Clr. Mr Draper to endeavour to follow up.
Clir. Mr Cleton reported that 2 repaired patches on Lawford Heath Lane were breaking up again.
Clr. Mr Draper to follow up.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>08-07/13</th>
<th>Date and Time of the Next Meeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clr. Mr Draper thanked everyone for attending and confirmed that the next meeting was due to take place on Tuesday 9th September at 7.30 pm in the Memorial Hall, Long Lawford.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Meeting was declared closed at 10.15pm

Signed: [Signature]  
Mr D Draper, Chairman  
Date: 9th September 2005
### MINUTES OF THE LONG LAWFORD PARISH COUNCIL MEETING HELD ON TUESDAY 10th JUNE 2008 IN THE MEMORIAL HALL, RAILWAY STREET, LONG LAWFORD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Present:</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cllr. Mr D Draper - Chairman (DD)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miss D Groves - Clerk (DG)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr. Mr M Davison - Vice-Chairman (MD)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr. Mrs E Clark (EC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr. Mr M. Conroy-Hargreaves (MC-H)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borough Cllr. Mrs S. Bragg (SB)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr. Mrs S. Lock (SL)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr. Mrs C. Watson (CW)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr. Mrs J Slack (JS)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr. Mrs P Wyatt (PW)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Cllr. Mr D Hodkinson (DH)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minute</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08-06/01</td>
<td>Opening of Meeting and Apologies for Absence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairman Cllr. Mr Draper welcomed everyone and opened the meeting at 7.30pm. Cllr. Mr Rye sent his apologies for absence, Cllr. Mrs Bragg sent apologies for arriving late at 7.55pm.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minute</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08-06/02</td>
<td>To Receive Police Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apologies were received from the Police as no-one was available to attend. A received police report was circulated. The various incidents were briefly discussed. Cllr. Mr Davison discussed an incident that had occurred at the Ryelands involving damage to a car, which had been reported to the Police, which was missing from the report.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minute</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08-06/03</td>
<td>To Invite Members of the Public to Speak on Matters of Concern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There were 2 members of the public present. Mr Steven Cowell of Prentice Close wished to bring to the attention of the Parish Council, Incident No. 572 involving damage caused to his wife’s car on the 17th May 08 in the sum of £300. Cllr. Mr Draper expressed concern, however pointed out that it was a Police issue and should be taken up with them. Mrs Lilian Pallikaropoulos stood up to speak when Cllr Mr Draper informed that he was not prepared to allow her to speak due to previous disruptions by her at recent Parish Council meetings, (which had included shouting out comments generally in reply to Agenda items being discussed by Parish Councillors, talking loudly in the background so that Councillors could not hear what was being discussed and on two/three occasions approaching Cllr. Mrs Wyatt, whispering to her and passing notes whilst the meeting was in progress). He further pointed out that she was not a Parish member. Mrs Lilian Pallikaropoulos commented that it was her intention to make a complaint to the Standards Board. Cllr. Mrs Wyatt bought up the issue of a personal letter received by Cllr. Mr Draper at which point Cllr. Draper informed that it was not an Agenda item and he was not prepared to enter into discussion about a private matter in open Council. In the meantime, two PCSO’s (Gev Tedds and Perminder Rai) arrived and apologised for being late. It was decided to invite the PCSO’s to speak. Mrs Lilian Pallikaropoulos and Mr Steven Cowell continued to have a private discussion in the background which was loud enough to interrupt proceedings and Cllr. Mr Draper requested that they please be quiet or they would be asked to leave, at which point they both left the meeting. The PCSO’s informed that they were aware that football was being played in Prentice Close, they commented that it involved young children whom they had asked to purchase a soft ball in order to play. They reported that a soft ball had been purchased and that the young children were being respectful and cooperative and were simply playing. As the children concerned were very young, they were unable to access the park. They further commented that they would have explained the situation to Mr Steven Cowell had he not left the meeting. Cllr. Mr Draper said it sounded reasonable behaviour. It was agreed by PCSO’s that they would visit Mr Steven Cowell to inform him of the situation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minute</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08-06/04</td>
<td>To Receive Declarations of Personal or Other Interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr. Mrs Wyatt declared a personal interest in matters relating to Livingstone Avenue (being a member of the Residents Association), any matters relating to Boughton Charities and any</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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matters relating to Rugby in Plume (being a member). Cllr. Mrs Watson declared a personal interest in matters relating to Warwickshire County Council (a family member is a County Councillor).

08-06/05 To Approve the Minutes of the Meeting held on Tuesday 13th May 2008.

Cllr. Mr Conroy-Hargreaves pointed out that the time recorded for the June meeting was incorrect and should read 7.30pm.

Item 08-05/16 after pictorial sign was needed insert "for the benefit of the non speaking members of the Parish."

The heading for the May Agenda should read "Minutes of the Annual Meeting of the Parish Council."

Item 08-05/06 last sentence should read "WCC could help" not held.

It was proposed by Cllr. Mrs Clark, seconded by Cllr. Mr Clifton and agreed by all to accept the Minutes of the 13th May 2008 meeting with the amendments above.

08-06/06 To Receive Progress Reports on Outstanding Items Not Covered Later on the Agenda

08-06/07 To Receive Reports From:

A) Management and Administration Panel

   a) Traffic Calming Measures – Railway Bridge & Townsend Lane. Cllr. Mrs Watson reported that residents had raised the point. It was felt that traffic speeds up in this area and due to the proposal of new houses behind Townsend Lane it will become increasingly difficult for traffic to emerge onto Townsend Lane near the main road. Cllr. Mrs Watson therefore felt that traffic calming measures were needed. There was general discussion regarding the various options available, including shekences, humps. Cllr. Mr Hodkinson suggested outlining the problem to Mr Roger Newham at WCC in the first instance, if nothing came of this approach, he proposed that he could then suggest that WCC come and view the area with the Parish Council to focus attention on the problem and shape the issue for them. Cllr. Mrs Watson to set out the problem in writing for the Clerk to forward onto Mr Newham at WCC.

   Proposed by Cllr. Mrs Watson, seconded by Cllr. Mrs Wyatt and agreed by all.

   CW & DG

   DG

   DG

   DG

b) Parish Council Training – Being a Good Councillor and Clerk. Cllr. Mrs Lock confirmed that she would be able to attend in September. Cllr. Mr Conroy-Hargreaves would not be available for either of the two dates. It was proposed by Cllr. Mrs Watson, seconded by Cllr. Mrs Slack and agreed by all that a place be booked for Cllr. Mrs Lock to attend.

   a) Bus Stops Back Lane. The Clerk outlined the proposal by WCC to reposition one of the poles (pole B) and asked for comments regarding the proposal. It was generally agreed that the pole should be moved, however the Clerk was asked to request that the pole be moved to the straight stretch towards the Village. Post Meeting Note: WCC have confirmed that they do not see a problem with the Parish Council's request. They will be in touch to inform when the works will be carried out shortly.

B) Recreation Grounds

C) Play and Leisure Group

   a) 106 Agreement Monies/Quotes for Equipment. The Clerk reported that new measurements had been obtained, as requested, to comply with the 30 metre boundary together with a noise assessment. She further reported that an e-mail had been sent to the 106 Officer at RBC in the first instance to outline the Parish Council's proposal to purchase the chosen equipment and that plans and the noise assessment had been sent to the Play Officer at RBC for information. Cllr. Mrs Watson commented that the layout had changed in order to comply with the 30 metre boundary and therefore
b) Roundabout Purchase for the Ryelands to replace existing spurnik. The Clerk informed that she had received written confirmation from Boughton Leigh to go ahead and purchase the new roundabout, as proposed. They confirmed that they would pay for the roundabout at a cost of £9,400 excl. VAT. Parish Council to pay the VAT element. Cllr. Mrs Slack proposed that the new roundabout be purchased, and a thank you letter be sent to the Boughton Leigh Charity. Cllr. Mr Cleton suggested that the Parish Council look into purchasing a plaque to install onto the Roundabout signifying that the Boughton Leigh Charity purchased the equipment, once it was installed, seconded by Cllr. Mr Davison and agreed by all.

D) Transport, Highways, Drains and Street Lighting

a) Cllr. Mr Conroy-Hargreaves reported that he had contacted WCC to introduce himself to WCC St. Lighting contact Kevin Fennell. He produced a list of all the St. lights in the Parish and informed that it was his intention to go on an inspection of the St. lights to see if there were any problems. It was reported that some lamps have no covers. Cllr. Draper informed that WCC only do a detailed inspection every 3 years and that in between times, inspections are carried out to simply ensure that lights are working. Judge Close St. light had been repaired. The handyman had filled in the whole in the base of the St. light in Holbrook Road and it was reported that No 7 St. light in Holbrook Road was not working. Cllr. Mrs Watson also reported a St. light not working in Townsend Lane.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>08-06/08</th>
<th>To Receive Borough Councillors Reports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>It was reported that Cllrs. Mrs Watson and Mrs Bragg had attended a training course re Licensing/Gambling, Taxi Licensing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Attended a presentation by Cemex of mechanical biological treatment at Malpass Farm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Attended a homeless workshop – strategies to deal with the homeless.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Reported a travellers encampment in Ling Lane - waiting to relocate to a permanent site elsewhere. It was noted that this was not a good enough reason to allow them to stay. 13th May were given 48 hrs notice to leave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Attended a NHS Trust meeting. Anyone can apply to be a member of the Trust, wanting to increase numbers. Cllr. Mrs Bragg to supply a leaflet for the Notice Board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Meeting attended with Environment Scrutiny Committee – re Transport/Waste/Rural Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Other meetings attended: Children's/young persons/families and Senior Members meetings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Cllr. Mr Hodkinson gave the Clerk and Chairman a definitive footpath map and spoke of footpath R128 and the upgrading of it, an objection by a resident was holding up progress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Cllr. Hodkinson also asked asking for an update on progress on Traffic Light design at Back Lane/Sheaf &amp; Sickle Junction/footpaths. Delays were caused by the need to acquire a small amount of land to get a footpath. It was also reported that there was not enough money to carry out what was initially intended in the 106 Traffic Agreement and that it was being proposed to make good what is currently in place. Regarding Bilton Lane, Western Side and the proposed footpath, there was an issue of occupation rights with residents in the area. If negotiations break down, delays could be caused. Cllr. Mr Hodkinson to e-mail Clerk plans and correspondence regarding the issue. Post Meeting Note: Plans and Correspondence received and copied to Chairman Cllr. Mr Draper.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### To received Details of Financial Matters

**a) Accounts for Payment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>CHQ NO.</th>
<th>ISSUED TO</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.6.08</td>
<td>1609/10/11/12</td>
<td>Confidential</td>
<td>£1,039.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.6.08</td>
<td>1613</td>
<td>Telecoms</td>
<td>£23.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.6.08</td>
<td>1614</td>
<td>Tax Refund 07/08 Confidential</td>
<td>£165.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.6.08</td>
<td>1615</td>
<td>Petty Cash – Vouchers 64-65</td>
<td>£19.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.6.08</td>
<td>1616</td>
<td>E-ON Electricity Pavilion</td>
<td>£32.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Outgoings June 2008 = £1,161.28
Total Incomings May 2008 = £35 (Refund Bank Charges 7.5.08)
Bank Balance as at 31<sup>st</sup> May 08 = £17,204.85

It was proposed by Cllr. Mrs Clark, seconded by Cllr. Mrs Lock and agreed by all to accept the accounts for payment.

**b) To Approve Audited Accounts.** It was proposed by Cllr. Mr Davison, seconded by Cllr. Mrs Clark and agreed by all to approve the audited accounts for 2007/08.

### To Receive Details of Planning Matters

1. **Appeal Decision – 13.5.08**
   - APP/E3715/A/07/2060256 – Land off School Street, Long Lawford
   - Outline Planning Permission has been granted subject to conditions for the erection of up to 99 dwellings with associated access at land off School St, Long Lawford.
   - Cllr. Mrs Wyatt enquired if the PC had received notice of a Public Enquiry. Clerk reported that the Parish Council had not received notice. Cllr. Mr Davison had produced a copy of the Public Enquiry date notice and it had been posted onto the Notice Board upon receipt.

### To Receive Items of Correspondence

1. Declarations of acceptance of office (new Cllrs.) sent to RBC
2. Cllr. Hodkinson Signalisation at Back Lane – proposal to move forward
3. Code of Conduct Training booked for Cllr. Mr Conroy-Hargreaves
4. Acceptance of Wicksteed Leisure Quote to repair Gate in KG's Field
5. Rugby Area Committee Public Questions 8<sup>th</sup> May 08
6. Paul Collett WCC propose meeting re Boyce Way with Clerk
7. Cllr. Mrs Lock – Code of Conduct Training Booked
8. Info sought on 50+ groups to be included in the “Going Out Book”
9. Mrs Dyer Reply re complaint – Bus Stops Back Lane
10. CC WCC Reply to Mrs Dyer above
11. E-Mail confirmation from Boughton Leigh Charity re purchase of Roundabout, Ryelands
12. Rural Dev. Fund Grants – Deadline 13.6.08
13. Civic Sunday Service Invitations
14. List of proposed BT payphone removals
15. Bus Stop Assessment Back Lane from WCC
16. Dec of personal interest forms to RBC (S.Lock and M. Conroy-Hargreaves)
17. Temporary Traffic Regs. L/Heath and Coalpit Lane, Bilton Lane and Cov Rd
18. WALK Governance & Accountability – Practitioners Guide Accounting Practices and Audit – Requested hard copy (163 pages)
19. Playdale plans to include 30 metre boundary
20. Playdale Noise Assessment Agoraspac
21. Play Officer RBC – Plans & Noise Assessment from Playdale sent
### 08-06/12

**Councillors Reports and Items for Future Agenda**

Cllr. Mr Draper informed that he had attended a Ling Hall meeting, site visit of Power Plant. For info, the power plant generates enough power to supply the whole of Long Lawford, with the prospect of another to be added, will generate enough to supply Church Lawford also. He pointed out that this was green power which is a benefit. Although the proposal to expand Ling Hall is accepted, the area in question was not pre-planned for this use, it has therefore been put to the Secretary of State.

Cllr. Mr Draper also informed that he had attended a Cemex Vehicle Routing meeting and felt that there was now some recognition of the importance of doing something with the B4453 Straight Mile in that once the Western Relief Road was opened, a lot more traffic would be using this road both to and fro. In Cllr. Draper's opinion should be upgraded to an A road. He felt that pressure to upgrade/widen the road was needed. Cllr. Mrs Watson informed that a meeting had taken place where funding was being looked at.

Cllr. Mrs Clark informed that her Grand-Daughter had cut herself as a result of playing on the Jackslide in the King George’s field and asked if the Council could look at replacing the seat and the platform which tends to be slippery when wet. Cllr. Mrs Watson suggested that maybe a wooden platform may be better. Cllr. Mrs Watson agreed to ask the Play & Leisure Group to look at the problem and suggest improvements.

Cllr. Mrs Lock reported that the youth shelter radio had once again been pulled out and that broken glass was evident in the area.

Cllr. Mrs Slack asked if anything could be done about speeding traffic on the A428

Cllr. Mr Draper agreed to pursue the Speed Aware Group regarding this issue.

Cllr. Mrs Wyatt requested that a postcard be placed on the Notice Board regarding CORE (over 50’s group).

Cllr. Mr Cleaton reported that both the self closing gates were not closing properly. The roundabout was not going round smoothly and mentioned that the seats were cracking. Cllrs. asked if it would be possible for the handyman to look at the roundabout to see if there was anything obvious preventing it from going round smoothly. The gates were requested to be placed on the Agenda for July meeting.

Cllr. Mr Cleaton also reported that he would be attending a “Play to Grow” free seminar.

Cllr. Mrs Watson reported that the AGM of the Cement Forum would be taking place on the 24th June in the Rokey Room should anyone wish to attend.

Cllr. Mr Draper enquired when the next Parish Newsletter would be produced. Cllr. Mrs Watson informed 26th July 08. The Clerk asked that the proposed “S Gate” in Boyce Way and the proposed moving of the fence by the Basketball Court be included as news items.

### 08-06/13

**Date and Time of the Next Meeting**

Cllr. Mr Draper thanked everyone for attending and confirmed that the next meeting was due to take place on Tuesday 8th July at 7.30 am in the Memorial Hall, Long Lawford.

*The Meeting was declared closed at 9.50pm*

---

**Signed:**

Mr D Draper, Chairman
In a message dated 11/11/2008 09:04:00 GMT Standard Time, claire.watson@rugby.gov.uk writes:

Lilian

As far as I am aware the Parish Council did not receive a copy of the Southam application. I certainly haven't seen a copy of it and do not have one in my possession.

I cannot understand why Pat thinks I have refused to let her see it as firstly she has never asked for it and secondly it would be impossible to give what I haven't got.

If the Parish Clerk has a copy of the Southam application and has refused to let Pat see it (and I can't think why she should) then that is a different matter.

I hope this clears up what is obviously a misunderstanding by Pat.

Regards

Claire

Cllr Mrs Claire Watson
Lawford & King's Newnham Ward

Tel: 01788 577509

From: K.Pallikaropoulos [mailto:costisp@batelco.com.bh]
Sent: 10 November 2008 20:48
To: Cllr Claire Watson
Cc: ‘Arnold Woolley'; gareth@gprevett.orangehome.co.uk; dianepask@hotmail.com; Cllr Noreen New; Cllr Neil Sandison; 'Roy Sandison'
Subject: re CEMEX APPLICATION MALPASS refusal to share info

Dear Claire
I understand you gave the Cemex Malpass application to Pat, (given to Long Lawford PC from WCC) for her to borrow temporarily, but that you did not allow her to have the Southam application.

Could you please explain why you would not let her have the Southam application?

If it was not in your possession who had it and refused to let Pat borrow it?

This is a very serious refusal to share information with a fellow parish councillor of long-standing and could well result in disciplinary procedures and Standards Board investigations and actions.

We are very upset about this, naturally, and hope you can sort it out asap. Thanks for your help.

Lilian

This e-mail has been scanned for all viruses by Star. The service is powered by MessageLabs. For more information on a proactive anti-virus service working around the clock, around the globe, visit:
http://www.star.net.uk

THIS E-MAIL AND ANY ATTACHED FILES ARE CONFIDENTIAL AND MAY BE LEGALLY PRIVILEGED.

Internet email is not to be treated as a secure means of communication. If you have received this transmission in error or are not the addressee, any disclosure, reproduction, copying, distribution or other dissemination or use of this communication is strictly prohibited. The information contained in this e-mail may be the subject of public disclosure under the Data Protection Act 1998, Freedom of Information Act 2000 or the Environmental Information Regulations 2004 unless legally exempt from disclosure, the confidentiality of this e-mail and your reply cannot be guaranteed. Visit http://www.rugby.gov.uk for more information.

Thank you for your co-operation.

Rugby Borough Council

Claire,

Just for clarification, the Parish Council has not been sent a copy of the SOUTHAM planning application. Therefore like yourself it would be impossible for me to give what I haven't got.

Debbie

Debbie
Subj: Fwd email from Rugby Times newspaper.
Date: 17/10/2008 12:22 GMT Standard Time
From: To: Debbie

Please find attached email as received from Lilian P. You will see that the info has been forwarded to her from Pat.

Regards

Keith

Original Message
From: Ben_Roberts@barr.co.uk
Date: 17/10/2008 12:11
To: <andy@blues.co.uk>
Subj: email from Rugby Times newspaper.

--- Forwarded by Duncan_Gibbons@vag.co.uk on 17/10/2008 12:11 ---

Duncan Gibbons
Editor
Rugby Times
024 7654 5678
--- Forwarded by Duncan_Gibbons@vag.co.uk on 17/10/2008 12:23 ---

Lilian Pellicano
l.p@rugbytimes.co.uk

--- Original Message ---
Subject: Email: LIPC VIC.E CH.-MALPASS APPLICATION 14.10.08.doc.jpg
Date: Thu, 16 Oct 2008 10:38:37 -0100
From: Patricia Wyatt <wyatt@empiretalk.net>
To: Lilian Pellicano <l.p@rugbytimes.co.uk>
CC: Patricia Wyatt <wyatt@empiretalk.net>

Lilian

Long Laundor have turned the cover application down R&B time.

Lilian

--- Original Message ---

Subject: Email: LIPC VIC.E CH.-MALPASS APPLICATION 14.10.08.doc.jpg
Date: Thu, 16 Oct 2008 10:38:37 -0100
From: Patricia Wyatt <wyatt@empiretalk.net>
To: Lilian Pellicano <l.p@rugbytimes.co.uk>
CC: Patricia Wyatt <wyatt@empiretalk.net>

Lilian

The message is ready to be sent with the following files or links attachments:

LIPC VIC.E CH.-MALPASS APPLICATION 14.10.08.doc.jpg

Note: In order to protect against computer viruses, email programs may prevent sending or receiving certain types of files attachments. Check your email security settings to determine how attachments are handled.

---------------

IMPORTANT NOTICE This email (including any attachments) is meant only for the intended recipient. It may also contain confidential and
Any views or opinions in this email are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of Trinity Mirror PLC or its
Trinity Mirror PLC is the parent company of the Trinity Mirror group of companies and is registered in England No 82549, with its offices

Hundreds of Free Games for all the family - http://www.viva.co.uk/play

Scanned Document attached to E-mail from Cur Wyatt to.
LP -> Duncan Gibbons

---

17 October 2008 10:01 - DGroup06
This application calls for an extra 320 traffic movement a day of which 260 are lorries.
36 lorry movements would take place between 7:00 and 19:00 resulting in a lorry movement a
very 3 minutes.

The plant would be operating 24 hrs a day

It should be also questioned why there is a need for 2500lts of engine oil this would be more than
ough for 100 lorry oil changes.

So why is there need for 20000lts of white diesel for road use.

This depot to be used for maintenance of lorries. Where the tanks are to be sited does not appear
to be on plan. Surely this adds to the fire risk of the development.

Could there be an incident on this site it could well mean that both mainline railways could be
losed as well as the RWRR. It could also affect a large area of rugby or the village as well as the
er Avon.

The plan states that biofilters would be used to filter emissions from the stack to remove particle
site fungus etc would these be able to remove bacteria within the water vapour. It also states
plume would not touch down. But any one living near Ling hall knows that certain weather
onditions can trap the emissions and hold them at ground level. Could this happen with this
development.

We believe that this council should oppose this development due to:

the extra noise and air pollution on those nearby,

and as it is too close to the urban population of both town and villages,

the possible impact if an incident occurred.

never if WCC is minded to approve the development consideration should be given to

1. A limit on lorry movements per day
2. No maintenance or fuelling of lorries on the site removing the need to store the oil a
3. Cemex to fund a health study of the effects of all their operations on the local area as part
of a 106 agreement
Subj: Malpass Application/Cemex/Minutes LLPC
Date: 08/11/2008 12:51:58 GMT Standard Time
From: DGroves06
To: claire.watson@ruby.gov.uk, mcdavison@hotmail.com, wyattwyvern@talktalk.net, krye@tiscali.co.uk, ericaiclarke@hotmail.co.uk, john.sack@tesco.net, rcleton@tiscali.co.uk, sarahhelen1975@googlemail.com, mconroyhargreaves@yahoo.co.uk

STRICTLY PRIVATE AND CONFIDENTIAL - NOT FOR RELEASE/DISCUSSION - COUNCILLORS ONLY

8th November 2008

Dear Councillors,

In the light of an e-mail sent to Cllr. Mrs Watson from Mrs Lilian Pallikaropoulos dated 3rd November 2008, I would like to inform you of the following for information:

Following LLPC’s last meeting dated 14th October 2008, on 16th October 2008, Cllr. Mrs P Wyatt sent an e-mail to Mrs Lilian Pallikaropoulos which included a scanned copy of notes concerning Cllr. Mr Davison’s observations regarding the Cemex Climafuel Planning Application which was produced at the meeting dated 14th October 2008 and circulated to Councillors only by Cllr. Mr M Davison.

Mrs Lilian Pallikaropoulos then sent an e-mail to the Editor, Duncan Gibbons at the Rugby Times Newspaper, dated 16th October 2008 with the message "Long Lawford have turned the Cemex application down BIG time..." and attached a copy of the forwarded “scanned notes from Cllr. Mr M Davison, received by her from Cllr. Mrs P Wyatt”.

Our Chairman, Cllr. Mr K Rye then received a telephone call from Ben Eccleston from the Rugby Times and was asked to confirm that Long Lawford Parish Council had released an e-mail condemning the Cemex Climafuel Planning Application. He responded that this was not true, no such e-mail had been released by the Parish Council. This “news” item, as far as I am aware was not therefore printed.

I would like to clarify the position as follows:

1. Observations to planning matters have to be submitted officially by the Clerk, and not by the Chairman or Vice-Chairman (as has been suggested was agreed by the Council by Mrs Lilian Pallikaropoulos in her e-mail dated 3rd November).

2. Whilst the contents of the notes circulated by Cllr. Mr M Davison were voted on and agreed with, with the exception of Cllr. Mrs Watson, who abstained, it was agreed that the Chairman/Vice Chairman would then circulate to all other Councillors a draft response to the planning application in order to allow other Councillors to add their own observations. Following a question from myself to ascertain whether there was indeed a time restriction and would there be time to do this and receiving a response from Cllr. Mrs Watson that there would be time and that observations would be accepted right up until the day before the application went to Committee which would be some time in December.

3. Since then, a draft observations response has been circulated to all Councillors requesting comments. I have received only one telephone call from Cllr. Mrs Watson making observations about traffic movement (to which I requested that Cllr. Mrs Watson submit those observations in writing to me so that they can be incorporated into a final document for submission by the Clerk - to date Claire, I have not received your observations?).

4. Given the above it would be incorrect procedure had the Council agreed that observations be submitted before the final draft was voted on and for me to submit observations in their “draft” form without a final draft being produced, incorporating all comments by all Councillors and voted on by the Council, as has been incorrectly suggested was the case by Mrs Lilian Pallikaropoulos.

Thank you
Clerk to Long Lawford & Little Lawford Parish Council
Debbie Groves
Saturday, October 25, 2008
CEMEX: SALE OF THE CENTURY?

CEMEX'S AGGRESSIVE EXPANSION COMES TO A STICKY END as Cemex try to reduce costs by £288 million by selling off assets and re-financing the £2 billion loan it used last year to buy Australia's RINKER group. So far sales of cement, concrete and aggregate plants are anticipated in Australia, Austria and Hungary and possibly in the USA, according to the press reports, which say that product sales are down by 20-30%, or so. The Credit Crunch has hit hard, and the loan has been restructured from 2009 to 2010 with a higher interest rate.

JOB LOSSES

worldwide equate to about 10% of the work force - about 6,000 jobs - as concrete sales flop and Cemex sells assets. In the UK Cemex has been working on efficiency; prioritising capital expenditure, and cutting back on investment in new projects and in some cases putting them on hold; reducing the cement and aggregate fleet to improve productivity, reducing shifts, overtime spend and head count across the business by at least 10%. Underutilised assets are to be closed and mothballed. Won't come a moment too soon for Rugby residents, who eagerly plan the street party to celebrate the permanent mothball of the monstrous

Documenting the ongoing battle for a healthier environment in what should be a pleasant market town...

Link to webcam
- click HERE to view the webcam

About Me
Lillian
For the past five years I have dedicated all my spare time to the pursuit of documenting and fighting industrial pollution as it continually affects my home town of Rugby.
View my complete profile

Links
- C.A.N.K.
- RugbyWebcam.com
- Rugby In Plume
- Rob Edwards Articles & Sources
- Colorado Citizens
- US Cement Blog
- A Blot
- Some Photos
- Environment Agency
- Rugby Council
- A podcast
- Freedom Of Information
- Cement Works Sources

Blog Archive
- 2008 (38)
- November (3)

ITS PLUMING AWFUL!
TOXIC DUST FROM CEMEX?
CEMEX SHUT DOWN!
LAING RAIL REPORT April 2004 as submitted is five years out of date, and only considered the 140 clay lorries each day, and is not relevant to this new proposal. The railway needs to be re-assessed as an alternative form of transport and the SOUTHAM site shows there would be much less environmental, air quality and health damage if that site were to be used, AND even more if the rail link re-opened. It would take off the road some 140 clay lorries each day, and the RDF 160, so say 300 HGVs a day on a 30 mile round trip. That would save about 4,500 lorry miles each day on small B roads and in the town of Rugby.

How much pollution is that - tail pipe, brakes and tyres, and the SAVING of 4,5000 miles a day of fossil fuels? No attempt has been made to seriously address the total lorries and the pollution that could be avoided.

 Posted by Lilian at 4:30 PM 1 comments

Wednesday, October 15, 2008

CEMEX HITS THE BUFFERS

AS RESIDENTS START TO FIGHT BACK!

LONG LAWFORD PARISH COUNCIL decided last night that the planning application for the half million tonne waste plant was a step too far. They threw it out unanimously on many varied grounds, including: the air quality deterioration; increased health risk; fire risk; transport and pollution impact of the hundreds more Heavy Goods Vehicles; danger to public health of the bacteria emissions from the planned MBT in an urban area; unsuitability of location; already high levels of industrial emissions; cumulative total of environmental and pollution impacts of Cemex operations; Health Impact Assessment required.

SOUTHAM IS THE ONLY POSSIBILITY! THE DISUSED RAILWAY MUST BE RE-OPENED - IT WAS SAFE-GUARDED FOR RUGBY CEMENT'S USE AT A COST OF MILLIONS TO THE PUBLIC! THIS WOULD REMOVE 400,000 + DAILY LORRY MILES BETWEEN SOUTHAM/RUGBY!

CEMEX IN BIG TROUBLE -DAVENPORT USA ITS NOT ONLY THE WASTE FUEL TRIALS, BUT ALTERNATIVE RAW MATERIALS
Accuracy of Minutes for Sept.9th plus agenda items request.

Date: 06/10/2008 15:20:12 GMT Standard Time

From: wyattwyvern@talktalk.net
To: DGroves06@aol.com
CC: Mark@davisonRRCCC.fsnet.co.uk, wyattwyvern@talkgas.net

Attn The Clerk to Long Lawford Parish Council.

Ms. Debbie Groves,

I have one or two problems with the accuracy of the "Draft" Minutes for September 9th, 2008. Owing to the fact I have been away and have many meetings to attend this week I inform you at this time I will be formally addressing my concerns with you later before the next meeting. One of my concerns is of course your referral to my proposal of the accuracy of the July Minutes and they not being an Agenda item. My proposal was covered on the Agenda under the item confirmation of the Minutes. My proposal script is omitted, and should therefore be included.

I would also mention items for the Agenda, should include "Sunnyside and Pigeons" concerns and the recent Cemex application at Malpass Farm Quarry. Have you been supplied with the three volumes explaining this application? If so, will they be available for Councillors to Loan?

Sincerely,

Cllr. Mrs. Patricia Wyatt.

---

1. July Minutes formally accepted as Correct
   Not allowed to reverse clerk to change Minutes - Intimidating
   Bullying
   Over Critical.

   Not allowed to discuss previous Minutes
   only Accuracy of Minutes can be addressed, not contents!?

2. See: replies attached re: Cemex planning and Pigeons/Sunnyside
Subj: Re: Accuracy of Minutes for Sept.9th plus agenda items request.
Date: 07/10/2008 11:45:47 GMT Standard Time
From: DGroves06
To: wyatthewyvern@talktalk.net
BCC: claire.watson10@yahoo.co.uk, ericajclark@hotmail.co.uk, ncleton@tiscali.co.uk,
moonroyhergreaves@yahoo.co.uk, sarahelen1975@googlemail.com,
mcclawson@hotmail.com, krye@tiscali.co.uk, john.slack@tesco.net

Dear Cllr Wyatt,

The Pigeons/Sunnyside item has been an Agenda item and discussed in previous meetings. It will be discussed under matters arising at the forthcoming meeting of 14.10.08.

The Cemex Planning Application will be treated as any other planning item and will, as is usual, be on the Agenda under planning matters.

Clerk to Long Lawford & Little Lawford Parish Council
Debbie Groves
Dear All,

Please be informed that a copy of the Cemex Planning Application will be available for all Councillors to view at the Memorial Hall on Saturday 11th October between 9 am and 11 am.

Kind Regards

Debbie Groves
Dear All,

Is this opportunity available to the PUBLIC as well?  If not, why not?

Cllr. Mrs. Patricia Wyatt

--- Original Message ---
From: DGroves06@aol.com
To: clairewaston10@yahoo.co.uk; mcdaivson@hotmail.com; wyattwyvern@iaalktalk.net; krrye@tiscali.co.uk; ericajclark@hotmail.com; john.stalk@tesco.net; rjgleton@tiscali.co.uk; sarahhelen1975@googlemail.com; mconroyhargreaves@yahoo.co.uk
Sent: Tuesday, October 07, 2008 11:40 AM
Subject: (no subject)

Dear All,

Please be informed that a copy of the Cemex Planning Application will be available for all Councillors to view at the Memorial Hall on Saturday 11th October between 9 am and 11am.

Kind Regards

Debbie Groves
Dear all,

Just to clarify the situation re the above, the purpose of the meeting is to enable Councillors to have the opportunity to view the application and get to grips with what is a large/complex planning matter. No decisions will be made.

Please also be aware that the meeting will take place upstairs in the Memorial Hall, the main Hall is otherwise booked for “other activities”.

With Kind Regards
Debbie
Subj: Fw: Appointment to view LLPC Accounts.
Date: 16/09/2008 12:22:36 GMT Standard Time
From: wyattwyvern@talktalk.net
To: DGroves06@aol.com
CC: wyattwyvern@talkgas.net

Dear Clerk, Long Lawford Parish Council,

I send this repeat E-mail awaiting reply incase you missed my request below, because you did send me an E-mail at 15:15hrs. yesterday regarding the noise assessment details requirements for the Agoraspaces.

Thank you,

Cllr. Mrs. Patricia Wyatt.

--- Original Message ---

From: Patricia Wyatt
To: DGroves06@aol.com
Cc: Patricia Wyatt
Sent: Monday, September 15, 2008 11:44 AM
Subject: Appointment to view LLPC Accounts.

Dear Debbie,

I would like to make an appointment to view the accounts of Long Lawford Parish Council on Wednesday 17th, September 2008 at the Memorial Hall at 11:00a.m.

Please confirm.

Regards,

Cllr. Mrs. Patricia Wyatt.
Subj: Re: Fw: Appointment to view LLPC Accounts.
From: DGroves06
To: wyattwyvern@talktalk.net
BCC: ericajclark@hotmail.co.uk, mcdavison@hotmail.com

Councillor Wyatt,

I did not send you any e-mails yesterday, nor have I sent you any e-mails during the past week!

The Noise assessment, as confirmed to you at the Parish Meeting of 9.9.08, was sent to you on the 11th JULY 08. (All other Councillors confirmed receipt of it).

Your appointment to view the "External Auditors Statement of Accounts" is confirmed for Wednesday 17th September at 11am at the Memorial Hall.

Debbie Groves

bcc: E. Clark, E McDavidson.
Debbie,

This is PROOF of my Email to you LAST THURSDAY JULY 10th 2008.

I still require to see the Accounts as they are before you send them to the EXTERNAL AUDITORS.

Mr. Draper did telephone me saying that I could see the accounts sometime next week. How is that suggestion possible? because, as I understand you saying earlier today that you were busy sorting out the paperwork to (I presume) send to the Auditors.

Why do you have to do what you are doing so urgently, since the closing date on the Notice Board states up to and including the 16th, July, 2008, for members of the Public to view the Accounts?

I have asked you for an appointment several times, even during previous Parish Council Meetings, and when on the June 9th. you instructed me to look at the Notice on the Parish Notice Board because you could not remember what the Notice stated. I actually said I would need to check my diary for exact dates, but that the dates were 16th on the Notice Board.

Please respond positively.

Cllr. Mrs. Patricia Wyatt.

----- Original Message ----- 

From: Patricia Wyatt
To: DGroves06@aol.com
Sent: Thursday, July 10, 2008 6:32 PM
Subject: Audit-Accounts - viewing appointment please.

Dear Debbie,

I would be grateful to receive an email with venue, dates and times which, would be your preference, then I will reply.

Thank you,

Patricia Wyatt.
Re: Clement Keys Audit Notice.

Date: 18/07/2008 11:43:14 GMT Standard Time
From: wyatthyvern@talktalk.net
to: dwd@longlawford.plus.com, DGroves06@aol.com

Dear Cllr. Draper - Chairman to Long Lawford Parish Council,

The problem you have told me about has to deal with the security of Emails as a secure method of communication. Whatever your opinion about Emails, I do not accept fully, and that is precisely why I telephoned the Clerk anyway, and the Clerk said she did not have any problem with her Emails. Nevertheless, I have not had any problem sending all my Emails because I SEND through Talktalk. Only upon receiving, and that did not apply in this case, I use Supanet and now Talktalk servers. I need to know why the Clerk has not replied to my Email sent on the 10th. JULY 2008 at 18:32hrs? or indeed any of the other Emails?

I, even as a Councillor, have NOT seen the ACTUAL Accounts, only AN EXCEL SPREADSHEET, which is certainly not the same. I did not raise my hand at the meeting when the question was posed and so in my book that indicates ABSTENTION. I have stated many times during the Parish Council meetings, I believe the Invoices should be seen by Councillors before the signing of cheques takes place. This procedure has never taken place for a few years. I would appreciate your understanding on this matter.

Cllr. Mrs. Patricia Wyatt.

—— Original Message ——
From: dwd
To: Patricia Wyatt ; DGroves06@aol.com
Sent: Wednesday, July 16, 2008 9:38 AM
Subject: Re: Clement Keys Audit Notice.

Dear Mrs Wyatt

I have told you before that emails are an uncertain method of communication. If you want to make an appointment you are better to telephone.

Unlike the general public, as a councillor you have already seen the accounts and approved them. If you wish to see them again I suggest you telephone Debbie to arrange a convenient time, which will probably be sometime next week.

David Draper

—— Original Message ——
From: Patricia Wyatt
To: DGroves06@aol.com ; david draper
Sent: Tuesday, July 15, 2008 10:43 PM
Subject: Clement Keys Audit Notice.

To Ms. D. Grove - Clerk and Cllr. Mr. David Draper - Chairman of Long Lawford Parish Council.


I have just been to look at the Clement Keys Official Notice entitling members of the Public to view the Accounts of Long Lawford Parish Council:

First of all the Notice states commencing from Tuesday the 17th. June and ending on Wednesday the 16th. July, 2008, which creates 19 days only NOT SIX WEEKS, (as you both stated on the telephone earlier today, ) because you stipulate time between 12:00noon and 15:00hrs Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday and Friday only.

I trust you will both acknowledge receipt of the repeated emails I have sent of PROOF MY REQUEST was made last Thursday.

Therefore I propose to be at the Memorial Hall at 12:00noon tomorrow.

Thanking you very much.

Cllr. Mrs. Patricia Wyatt.
In a message dated 09/07/2007 16:32:14 GMT Standard Time, wyattwyvern@talkgas.net writes:

Dear Debbie,

Thank you for this notice. Please accept my apologies as the engagements I mentioned to you on the telephone prohibit me from attending.

I would like to make arrangements with you to see the Accounts of the L.L.P.C. at a convenient time and place please.

Regards,

Patricia Wyatt.

--- Original Message ---
From: DGroves06@aol.com
To: wyattwyvern@talkgas.net
Sent: Tuesday, July 03, 2007 4:59 PM
Subject: Finance Committee Meeting

Dear Pat,

Just to let you know that the above meeting will take place on Thursday 5th at 7pm at David Draper's house. This was the most convenient date and time for the majority.

Regards

Debbie Groves

Pat,

As requested, I have arranged to have access to the Memorial Hall Upstairs Meeting Room on the following dates and times for you to inspect the Parish Council Accounts.

Tuesday 17th July between 2pm and 3pm
Wednesday 18th July between 1pm and 2pm
Thursday 19th July between 11.30 and 12.30am

Please let me know your choice and I will arrange for the Accounts to be available.

Debbie Groves

No reply, didn't arrange to come and view the accounts!
Subj: Agoraspce Noise Assessment
Date: 11/07/2009
To: clairewatson10@yahoo.co.uk, rjclaton@tiscali.co.uk, ericejclark@hotmail.co.uk, john.slack@tesco.net, wyattwyvern@talkgas.net

Please find attached the above Assessment for your information.

Debbie Groves

9.9.08. Curle Wyatt saying she has not had a copy of the Noise Assessment. Everyone has confirmed they have received it.

Noise Assessment key note from July 07 Meeting.
Subj: Notice Board Item Request Tuesday 8.7.08
Date: 10/07/2008
To: wyattwyvern@talkgas.net

Pat,

You requested that an item be placed on the Notice Board at the Parish Council meeting of 8.7.08 at which you were informed that at present there was insufficient room. At that point it was suggested that the item be included in the Newsletter. Claire informed that she would try to squeeze it in for you.

We have tried to contact you this pm to get the information to put in the Newsletter, however you are not at home (9.20pm, Thursday 10.7.08). Therefore, it will now be too late for inclusion in the Newsletter which is due to be printed tomorrow (Friday).

In that case, if you would like to provide me with the leaflet/poster?, I will remove something off the Notice Board in order to make some space for it to be displayed for a short time.

Thank you

Debbie Groves

No Reply!
Hello Debbie,

I am interested to know electronically, when and what time did you actually receive my email sent on the 4th. July at 14:52.

Thanks,

Patricia.

--- Original Message ---
From: Patricia Wyatt
To: DGroves06@aol.com
Sent: Friday, July 06, 2007 10:28 PM
Subject: Re: Agenda items please.

Dear Debbie,

I will submit some or same under correspondence for the 10th. meeting.

Thank you very much,

Regards,

Patricia.

--- Original Message ---
From: DGroves06@aol.com
To: wyattwyvern@talkgas.net
Sent: Thursday, July 05, 2007 10:02 PM
Subject: Re: Agenda items please.

Dear Pat,

Unfortunately, you are too late for your items to be included on next Tuesday's (10th July) Parish Council Meeting Agenda. — CAS PER PARISH COUNCIL MEETING ORDERS — 7 CLEANUP DAYS — NOTICE RE.

I will keep a copy of your e-mail and put them onto the Agenda for September if you wish. Please let me know.

LLPC Clerk
Debbie Groves

Pat,

Your e-mail was received on 5.7.07 at 15.35 pm — See attached

Debbie

Debbie Groves

At Two Parish Council Meetings since, July e Sept. Clerk has been accused publicly of not placing items on the Agenda for Clee Wyatt. The above request is the only request I have ever received from Clee Wyatt for an item to be placed on the Agenda.
Subject: Agenda items please.
Date: 05/07/2007 15:35:20 GMT Standard Time
From: wyattwyvern@talkgas.net
To: DGroves05@aol.com

Dear Debbie,

Please can you arrange the following within the next Parish Council Agenda to cover:-

1. Climafuel application - Cemex.
2. Report from Joint meeting WALC with RBC
3. Waste and it's future.
4. Road accident at Lawford Cross roads on the A428.

Regards,

Cllr. Mrs. Patricia Wyatt
REMINDERS FOR PARISH COUNCIL 10TH. SEPTEMBER 2008

AGENDA.

ACCURACY FIRST

08/07/03

SEVERAL PLACES NEED CORRECTION REGARDING MRS. LORRAINE THOMAS SHOULD READ MISS  PAGE 388 AND 389

MRS. PALLIKAROPOULOS IS MIS-SPelt TWICE  PAGE 389

LAST ITEM  STANDING ORDERS WERE INSTATED IS INCORRECT  THEY DO NOT HAVE TO BE SUSPENDED WHEN IT IS AN AGENDA ITEM NOR REINSTATED  PAGE 389

AND  CLR. MRS. WYATT DISTRIBUTED A PROPOSAL TO MAKE AN IMPORTANT CORRECTION TO THE JUNE MINUTES BEFORE THE MEETING COMMENCED  PAGE 389

08-07-05 AT THE BOTTOM OF PAGE 389 SHOULD READ - MEMBERS OF THE DRIVING PUBLIC.

08-07/08 PAGE 394 TOP  "'"'"'"'"'"'"

08/07/09 I WOULD PREFER TO SEE THE INCOMING FOOTBALL FEE SEPARATE  ALL RECEIPTS ETC ARE DISCUSSED AND DECIDED AT FINANCE COMMITTEE MEETINGS.

Pu was a no but has not attended a meeting.

08/07-11 I FIND IT UNACCEPTABLE TO NOT RECORD THE LIST OF CORRESPONDENCE AND WHEN I LOOKED TWICE ON THE NOTICE BOARD THE LIST WAS NOT ON DISPLAY.

08/07/12 MRS. MRS. CLARKE AND MRS. WYATT NOT MRS SLACK, SHE WAS DUE ON HOLIDAY.

MATTERS ARISING FROM MINUTES

I WOULD LIKE TO PROPOSE THE CLERK WRITES TO MRS. ALISON HODGE REGARDING RULINGS AND REGULATIONS UPON PUBLIC PARTICIPATION  PAGE 387 - NOT SECONDED BY ANYONE (CLERK HAS ALREADY OBTAINED INFORMATION)

DID THE CLERK OBTAIN A QUOTE FROM THE NATIONAL PIGEON ASSOCIATION  SEE PAGE 388.

AS REPORTED ORALLY BY CLERK ON 9.9.08, NORTHERN NATIONAL PIGEON ASSOC. NO. GIVEN 01405 265516, INFORMED BY POSTMAN ON 4.9.08 THAT INTERCEPTIVE MEETING WAS TO BE GAVE TO CLERK. NO REPLY FROM PIGEON CONTROL ADVISORY COUNCIL 01833 617238 - NOT IN PC JURISDICTION TO GET RID OF PIGEONS, SEE MINUTES 27/08.
SEWERAGE PROBLEM BACK LANE - HAS CLLR DRAPER INVESTIGATED. PAGE 389 NEAR TOP.

CLLR. DRAPER INFORMED THAT THE MINUTES OF MEETINGS WERE NOT DRAFT - OF COURSE THEY ARE DRAFT UNTIL RATIFIED AT THE COMMENCEMENT OF NEXT MEETING. HALF WAY DOWN PAGE 389.

08-07-05 CLLR. DRAPER REQUESTED THAT MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC E'D UP; LEFT THE MEETING. THIS WAS NOT ON THE AGENDA NOR DID CLLR. DRAPER QUOTE THE PASSAGE FROM THE ACTS FOR THIS ACTION TO TAKE PLACE AND NO VOTE WAS GIVEN BY THE COUNCILLORS.

The was not requested to be placed on Agenda. - chapman was unsure of it. My resolution was not read out aloud or properly presented verbally for discussion. Everyone had a personal written copy handed to them by plu. No-one had any comments to make. See minutes 8/7/02. My proposal, written and presented to each councillor and voted upon, should therefore be included within the minutes agreed with plu. See minutes 8/7/02.

08-07/06 HAVE WE BEEN GIVEN A COPY OF THE NOISE ASSESSMENT?

Noise assessment was sent to all Cllrs. on play committee and plu. 11/7/08.

REMEMBRANCE NOTES FOR PARISH COUNCIL 8TH. JULY 2008-07-08

NO SMOKING NOTICES STILL REQUIRED IN BUS SHELTER PLEASE.
No smoking notice have been in bus shelter since this July.

SORRY I WAS UNABLE TO ATTEND PLAY EQUIPMENT EXHIBITION BUT I DID PUT A NOTICE IN THE PARISH COUNCIL NOTICE BOARD AT THE GREEN. 2 NOT MENTION OF A NOTICE BOARD AT THE GREEN, KEYS? IF THERE IS NOT THE OFFICIAL NOTICE BOARD. Notice board proper is opposite the Co-op in the Village.

I CARRIED OUT A LITTER PICK BOTH SIDES OF THE A428 AT THE LAWFORD CROSS ROADS.

I ATTENDED THE ANNUAL FOSTER'S BRIDGE MEETING AND THE MINUTES ARE ON THE R.B.C. WEB. OR DOES THE CLERK HAVE A COPY?

I AM A MEMBER OF THE RUGBY BOROUGH COUNCIL STANDARDS COMMITTEE.
THIS REPORT OMITS TO MENTION THAT I WAS NOT GIVEN SUFFICIENT NOTICE OF MEETINGS AND MY DIARY WAS FULL. UNTRUE, ALL MEETINGS WERE ARRANGED WITH NOTICE (AT LEAST ONE WEEK), ALL OTHER MEMBERS WERE ABLE TO ATTEND. I WAS NOT ATTENDED ANY FINANCE MEETING - SOME 51/6 AND ONLY SENT APOLOGIES CAUSE.

REMINDER NOTES FOR PARISH COUNCIL 8TH JULY 2008-07-08

NO SMOKING NOTICES STILL REQUIRED IN BUS SHELTER PLEASE.

SORRY I WAS UNABLE TO ATTEND PLAY EQUIPMENT EXHIBITION BUT I DID PUT A NOTICE IN THE PARISH COUNCIL NOTICE BOARD AT THE GREEN.

I CARRIED OUT A LITTER PICK BOTH SIDES OF THE A428 AT THE LAWFORD CROSS ROADS.

I ATTENDED THE ANNUAL FOSTERD'S BRIDGE MEETING AND THE MINUTES ARE ON THE R.B.C. WEB. OR DOES THE CLERK HAVE A COPY?

I AM A MEMBER OF THE RUGBY BOROUGH COUNCIL STANDARDS COMMITTEE

REPEATED
Dear Pat,

I have just tried to telephone you (25th March, 5.45pm) with no response.

I am therefore e-mailing you to inform that we are holding a Finance Committee Meeting on Friday 28th March at 7.30pm at my home.

This is because we need to discuss the payment of the lighting columns and the invoice just received.

Please could you let me know as soon as possible if you are able to attend.

Thank you

Debbie Groves

No reply, nor Wyatt has not attended any Finance Committee Meetings, of which there have been 5/6. I have received an apology once - 5th July meeting.
FROM CLLR. MRS. PATRICIA WYATT. 
08.07.08.

DEAR COUNCILLORS FOR INFORMATION;

I PROPOSE THE FOLLOWING CORRECTION TO MINUTES OF THE LONG LAWFORD PARISH COUNCIL MEETING HELD ON TUESDAY 10TH JUNE 2008 IN THE MEMORIAL HALL, RAILWAY STREET, LONG LAWFORD.

MINUTE 08-06/03. To Invite Members of the Public to Speak on Matters of Concern.

Item No. 5. To approve Minutes. 
At 08-06/03. This Council has previously made a decision to NOT record names within the Minutes of members of the Public. I have mentioned this matter previously, so why has it not ceased? The Minutes are meant to be only a resume and NOT verbatim, again, as I have previously been repeatedly told.

THERE I PROPOSE THE FOLLOWING CHANGE BE RECORDED AS WRITTEN BEFORE YOU.

Mrs. Lilian Pallikaropoulos SHOULD READ A lady present stood up to speak but was told by Cllr. Draper that he was not prepared to allow her to speak. The lady had been informed her rights to speak but was still refused permission by Cllr. Draper. He accused her of being disruptive during previous meetings. A councillor then asked Cllr. Draper to explain how the lady had been disruptive, but no reply was given. Cllr. Draper further pointed out that she was not a Parish Member. The lady stated that she had written to Cllr. Draper prior to the meeting, requesting him to retract his inaccurate accusations, which he had written about her in a letter to Cllr. Wyatt. This he refused and so the lady stated that she would report him to the Standards Board.

Cllr. Mrs. Wyatt then tried to discuss incorrect concerns within a letter written by the Chairman and signed by Cllr. David Draper Chairman of Long Lawford Parish Council. This was not allowed.
NOTICE OF APPOINTMENT OF DATE FOR THE EXERCISE OF ELECTORS' RIGHTS

ACCOUNTS FOR THE YEAR ENDED 31 MARCH 2009

Audit Commission Act 1998
The Accounts and Audit Regulations 2003 (SI 2003/533) as amended by the Accounts and Audit (Amendment) (England) Regulations 2006(SI 2006/554)

NOTICE

1. Date of announcement 3rd JUNE 2008 (a)

2. Each year the Council's annual return is audited by an external auditor appointed by the Audit Commission. Any person interested has the opportunity to inspect and make copies of the Annual Return and all books, deeds, contracts, bills, vouchers and receipts etc. relating to them. For the year ended 31st March 2008 these documents will be available on reasonable notice on application to:

(c) Mrs D. GROVES
IT Edinburgh Ltd
Laytown Lawford
Kentish CAV 3223 SHPE

between the hours of (d) 12 and (d) 3 on

(e) Tuesday 2008 to (f) Friday 2008

commencing on (f) 17th JUNE 2008

and ending on (g) 20th July 2008

3. Local Government Electors and their representatives also have:

- the opportunity to question the auditor in writing about the accounts. The auditor can be contacted at the address in paragraph 4 below for this purpose on (h) 21 July 2008 and after that date until the audit has been completed; and
- the right to make objections to the accounts or any item in them. Written notice of an objection must be given to the auditor and a copy sent to the (i) Council/Meeting.

4. The council's audit is being conducted under the provisions of the Audit Commission Act 1998, the Accounts and Audit Regulations 2003 (as amended) and the Audit Commission’s Code of Audit Practice. Your audit is being carried out by:

A T Robertson
Clement Keys
39/40 Calthorpe Road
Edgbaston
Birmingham
B15 1TS

5. This announcement is made by

(f) [Signature]

NOTES

(a) Insert date of placing of the notice which must be not less than 14 days before the date in (f) below

(b) Delete as appropriate

(c) Insert name, position and address of the Clerk or other person to which any person may apply to inspect the accounts

(d) Insert the times between which any person may apply to inspect the accounts. NB indicate if there is a lunchtime closure

(e) Insert working days of the week any person may apply to inspect the accounts – usually Monday to Friday allowing for any days the council is usually closed

(f) Insert date at least 21 working days before the date appointed for audit in (h) below

(g) The inspection period between (f) and (g) must be 20 working days and (g) must be at least one day before the date appointed for audit in (h) below

(h) The date appointed by the auditor

(i) Delete as appropriate

(g) Insert name and position of person placing the notice
Total Outgoings April 2008 = £7,310.70
Total Incomings April 2008 = £25,284.60
Bank Balance as at 30th April 2008 = £24,740.29

It was proposed by Cllr. Mrs Clark, seconded by Cllr. Mrs Slack and agreed by all to accept the accounts for payment.

b) Appointment of Internal Auditor for 08/09

It was proposed by Cllr. Mrs Watson, seconded by Cllr. Mr Rye and agreed by all to appoint Mr Mike Spencer as internal auditor for 08/09. Letter of appointment to be sent by the Clerk.

c) End of Year 07/08 Accounts Approval Subject to Internal Audit Completion

The end of year accounts were distributed to all Councillors before the end of April. It was proposed by Cllr. Mrs Clark, seconded by Cllr. Mr Rye and agreed by all to approve the end of year accounts subject to Internal Audit and Completion.

d) Clement Keys – Extended Audit 07/08 – The Clerk informed that an extended audit would be carried out by the external auditors for the 07/08 financial year to be submitted by 21st July 08.

08-05-14

To Receive Details of Planning Matters

1. R08/0699/HOUS – Erection of a rear Conservatory
   6 Chapel Street, Long Lawford

2. R08/0715/PLN – Installation of a 0.74 Satellite Dish
   5 Holbrook Road, Long Lawford

3. R08/0520/Hous – Erection of a rear Conservatory
   69 Townsend Lane
   RBC granted planning permission for the above planning application.

4. WCC Notice – Planning permission is granted for the application to extend Ling Hall Quarry.

5. APP/E3715/A/07/2054215 – Appeal Decision
   Land to the rear of 5-27 Townsend Lane, Long Lawford
   The appeal is allowed and outline planning permission is granted for the demolition of existing dwelling (No. 7), construction of access road and new residential properties at land to the rear of Nos. 5-27 Townsend Lane. Subject to Conditions.

08-05-15

To Receive Items of Correspondence

1. Resignation Letter from Cllr. Mr D Muldoon
2. Resignation Letter from Cllr. Mr W Cleaver
3. PC Chris Fisher – Boyce Way/Basketball Area
4. Mobile Police Station Timetable
5. WCC Paul Cowley update on reported repairs
6. Highway Maintenance Funding – Update request
7. Police Bulletin
8. Stray Dogs – Legislation Update
9. Rugby in Bloom Competition info.
10. Clement Keys – audit deadline
11. Request for Parish Docs. On RBC's Website
Debbie,

This is what I sent to you on SUNDAY.

You said this morning that your email service over the weekend was OK when I asked you earlier today.

Patricia Wyatt.

------ Original Message ------
From: Patricia Wyatt
To: DGroves06@aol.com
Sent: Sunday, July 13, 2008 10:23 PM
Subject: Accounts appointment

Dear Debbie,

I would be grateful if you telephone me with the arrangements venue, time and date to enable me to see the LLPC Accounts.

I have been without email services both inward and outward since 22:49hrs. 11.07.08.

Talktalk have now managed to get my outward emails to work, (and I have confirmation because some people have telephoned me) but, my incoming server will still not work.

Many thanks for your help.

Mrs. Patricia Wyatt.
Debbie,

This is what I sent to you yesterday.

----- Original Message ----- 
From: Patricia Wyatt
To: DGroves06@aol.com
Sent: Monday, July 14, 2008 2:16 PM
Subject: Accounts arrangement

Dear Debbie,

I have changed my email address today to be

wyattwyvern@talktalk.net

Mrs. Patricia Wyatt.
MINUTES OF THE LONG LAWFORD PARISH COUNCIL MEETING HELD ON TUESDAY 13th January 2009 IN THE MEMORIAL HALL, RAILWAY STREET, LONG LAWFORD

Present:  
Cllr. Mr K. Rye - Chairman (KR)  
Miss D. Groves - Clerk (DG)  
Cllr. Mr M. Davison - Vice-Chairman (MD)  
Cllr. Mrs E. Clark (EC)  
Cllr. Mrs S. Lock (SL)  
County Cllr. Mr D Hodkinson (DH)  
Cllr. Mr R. Cleton (RC)  
Cllr. Mrs P. Wyatt (PW)  
Cllr. Mrs J. Slack (JS)  
Borough Cllr. Mrs S. Bragg (SB)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minute</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 09/01/01 | Opening of Meeting and Apologies for Absence  
Chairman Cllr. Mr Rye welcomed everyone and opened the meeting at 7.45pm. Cllr. Mr Conroy-Hargreaves sent apologies for absence due to work commitments. Cllr. Mrs Watson sent apologies due to illness. (Cllr. Mr Hodkinson and BC Mrs Bragg left the meeting at 9.30pm) |
| 09/01/02 | To Receive Police Report  
The police report was circulated and discussed with the Police and Community Safety Wardens. Chairman Cllr. Mr Rye thanked the officers for their attendance. |
| 09/01/03 | To Invite Members of the Public to Speak on Matters of Concern  
The Chairman informed that this was the opportunity for members of the public to speak in accordance with the Parish Council’s standing orders, this would be for 30 mins. in total, allowing for 2 minutes per person, time permitting and depending on the complexity of the issue. If further discussion was necessary the Chairman could suspend standing orders or have the item added to a future agenda.  
4 members of the public were present. It was reported that the recent leakage of emissions from the Cemex plant had been confirmed as hazardous. The Council, when discussing supplying Minutes to the local paper, was asked to consider noting that minutes were draft minutes until approved. The problem of buses in Back Lane was once again raised. Cllr. Mr Hodkinson requested a copy of the e-mail sent by the Clerk to WCC regarding the issue. Cllr. Mr Hodkinson confirmed that a request had been made to ease back the curb. The recent failure of the pumping station in Back Lane was raised. The Environmental Agency had now become involved and had committed to monitoring the situation and using powers to levy fines and enforce the owners to rectify the problems with the pumping station. It was requested to look at cutting back the hedge in Back Lane, as this was not a Parish Council issue, Cllr. Mrs Bragg volunteered to investigate. The Council was asked if it had the power to stop a planning application, the reply confirmed that the Parish Council could object to a planning application only. |
| 09/01/04 | Standing Orders were instated |
| 09/01/05 | To Approve the Minutes of the Meeting held on Tuesday 11th November 2008  
Page 423, 08/12/03 - Cllr. Mrs Wyatt proposed that the line "There is an application to introduce regulation for hazardous dust which is put into cement by the environment agency" be taken out of the Minutes. Not seconded, no other comments received.  
Page 424, 08/12/06 - Cllr. Mrs Wyatt felt some discord about the Clerk minuting her awareness of how Minutes should be recorded and proposed that this be changed. Not seconded, no other comments received.  
Page 426, 08/12/09 f – Cllr. Mrs Wyatt pointed out that the ditch was in South View Road and not... |
Livingstone Avenue, the Clerk confirmed that this was correct (this had been noted on the Minutes produced from the December meeting).
Cllr. Mrs Wyatt complained that she had requested that Dog Signs be placed on the Agenda for January and this had not been done. It was pointed out to Cllr. Mrs Wyatt that the item was on the Agenda at item 9 a). Apologies were made.
Cllr. Mrs Wyatt complained that she had requested that Double White Lines on the A428 had been requested to be placed on the Agenda for January and this had not been done. It was pointed out to Cllr. Mrs Wyatt that the item was on the Agenda at item 9 j)
Chairman, Cllr. Mr Rye requested Cllr. Mrs Wyatt to please read her copy of the Agenda when it is received and prior to Parish Council meetings.
It was proposed by Cllr. Mrs Slack, seconded by Cllr. Mrs Clark and agreed by all to accept the December Minutes, except Cllr. Mrs Wyatt who was against.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>09/01/06</th>
<th>To Receive Progress Reports on Outstanding Items Not Covered Later on the Agenda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Clerk informed that a fence repair had been carried out in the Top Field over Christmas and a dog bin had been resurrected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It was reported that new trees planted by the BC were interfering with the Parish Council’s fields. BClr. Mrs Bragg will take up the problem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cllr. Mrs Wyatt disagreed with and questioned how the Clerk had recorded the departure of Invited Borough Councillors in the Minutes of 9th December 08. The Clerk informed that it is the responsibility of the Clerk in how Minutes and Agendas are produced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BClr. Mrs Bragg affirmed with the Council that it was requested that a BC representative come along to make a short presentation on the new recycling bins at 7.15pm on Tuesday 10th February, just before the start of the next Parish Council meeting. This was affirmed by the Council. This would be publicised on the Agenda for the February 09 meeting.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>09/01/07</th>
<th>To Receive Borough/County Council Reports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The following report was received and read to Council by BClr. Mrs Bragg:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There is a delay in fitting the staggered barriers by Boyce Way due to a query on land ownership. Could the Clerk make some enquiries? Claire is quite sure that it is not Parish owned as the Parish is not responsible for the grass cutting there. Could it also please be minuted that the Parish Council is in full support of gating as was asked at the last meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paul Collett from the County Council has indicated that funding for the rural hub camera equipment is looking promising and we will have a further update after this month’s anti social behaviour meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>We have heard of a distraction burglary in Elizabeth Way, Long Lawford and request that the word is spread around to ensure that ID and sufficient precautions are taken before allowing service men into your home.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The children of Long Lawford Primary School are making a visit to the Town Hall this week which will include a tour of the chamber and the Mayor’s parlour.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The flashing “slow” sign near the Sheaf and Sickle pub had been reported as faulty and has been restored to full working order.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Claire and Sally visited the William Davies building site off Tee Tong Road (whilst delivering the village newsletters) to try and find a brickie to carry out the infill of the wall behind the Pavilion. Nobody was on site and no building work was in progress (probably due to the present economic climate). The social houses have been built and are occupied. Could we ask for the Parish to seek quotations for the work or is it a job that could be carried out by the handyman? Council’s Response: It was decided that as the handyman is not a bricklayer, the Clerk was requested to obtain a quote for the work.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following report was received and read by County Cllr. Mr Hodkinson:

Report by County Councillor Doug Hodkinson

2. Back Lane and Bilton Lane footpath schemes.
4. Rugby Western Relief Road.

No significant developments to report on these projects since December. Progress with the Sheaf and Sickle junction remains dependent on answers to be got out of the Builders who signed the S106 agreements WCC needs to get modified. So far one builder has asked for more information to assist with a response, but that is all.

I continue to prefer to resolve this and the two footpath schemes in one overall plan. However, if the delays go on much longer, we may wish to see if the Bilton Lane footpath route needs to be settled more quickly so that impact of the work on road traffic is got over before the Western Relief Road is fully open.

5. Climafuel plant planning applications, Malpass Farm and Long Itchington.

I met with the Case Officer this morning to get fully up to date for this evening.

Consultations with main statutory bodies, e.g. the Borough Council and the Environment Agency (EA), are taking longer than the minimum hoped for. In the case of the EA their response has raised fresh detailed matters needing clarification. However, nothing indicated by the EA so far suggests anything other than "Approval subject to conditions" for both Applications.

To date there have been 7 letters of objection to the Malpass Farm application and 172 letters of objection to the proposal at Long Itchington – in many cases from people along the expected routes for the extra lorry traffic.

Once the main consultee's views allow the Officers to see a path, for instance, towards Approval, they will then go on to look at the responses of this Parish Council and other similar consultees. I sought and received assurance that your letter would of course be carefully considered, and I picked out for particular attention the point you made relating to the not-obviously-relevant scale of oil storage being proposed on-site.

As a result of all this, 17 March is now the likely earliest date for Regulatory Committee to consider applications.

I am reserving my own comments until the Borough Council’s response is known, but I have already flagged up verbally two points in the event both Applications being recommended for approval:

1. Avoiding two Plants being built - To request inclusion of a legally enforceable mechanism to ensure that if the first Plant is built (at either location), then the second cannot also be built without a further planning application. This would be most relevant if the spare site was to be sold off to someone else in this same line of business.

2. Landscaping - Bearing in mind the need to promote at least mitigation measures over damage done to natural habitats, to ask that this be widened in scope to include landscaping on and off the site designed to soften its visual impact that could also act as wildlife corridors. The opening up the Western Relief Road will make the site very highly
visible. Also, the site is part of a somewhat time-worn industrial area that is much less attractive than the school playing fields, woodland belts or open farmland elsewhere on the new road route.

Doug Hodkinson
County Councillor, Lawford and New Bilton Division
Warwickshire County Council

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09-01/08</td>
<td>To Consider the exclusion of the public and press for consideration of confidential items None this Month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/01/09</td>
<td>To Receive Reports from Sub-Committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A. Finance &amp; Administration Panel/Clerk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) Adoption of the Freedom of Information Act – No comments were made on this document circulated at December’s meeting. The Clerk to correct spelling mistakes. It was proposed by Cllr. Mr Davison, seconded by Cllr. Mrs Clark and agreed by all to adopt the Freedom of Information Act.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Wall behind the Pavilion – Discussed in BClirs. Reports above. Agenda item for February 09.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) Retractable wooden bollards by the Basketball Court – Cllr. Mrs Watson to update in February 09 as not present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d) Ditch Clearing, Livingstone Avenue – Cllr. Mrs Watson to update in February 09 as not present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e) Dog Signs in Village – KING GEORGE FIELD - After discussion, it was proposed by Cllr. Mrs Slack, seconded by Cllr. Mr Cleton, 5 in favour, 2 against that dogs be banned entirely from the King George V Recreation Field. It was confirmed that dogs were prohibited from the field in the Deeds. TOWNSEND LANE RECREATION FIELD AND THE RYE LANDS – After discussion, it was proposed by Cllr. Mr Cleton, seconded by Cllr. Mrs Clark to allow dogs on leads on both fields. The Play Committee was asked to produce a list of exactly where to place signs for February’s meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f) Parish Council Newsletter – Regarding the proposal to look at printing costs, this had not progressed. It was requested to be placed on the Agenda for February 09.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>g) Supplying Minutes to the Local Paper – Discussion took place regarding recent problems encountered when it was decided that minutes would no longer be issued for press reporting purposes. Proposed by Cllr. Mrs Slack, seconded by Cllr. Mrs Clark and agreed by all. The Clerk was requested to write a letter to inform the local reporter of the decision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>h) Grass Cutting Tender(s) Season 09/10 – The Clerk informed that repeated requests had been made to the current contractor for a quote (quote A), no quote received. A further quote had been obtained from another contractor (quote B). It was proposed by Cllr. Mrs Clark, seconded by Cllr. Mr Cleton and agreed by all to accept the new contractor’s quote B. It was confirmed that grass cutting would be carried out under the same conditions as Season 08.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i) Broken Slats on Wooden Bench outside the Community Centre – The Clerk reported the current situation. RBC would look to see if it could be repaired, falling which RBC would endeavour to replace it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>j) Double White Lines on the A428 – Cllr. Mrs Wyatt commented that this had been an agenda item previously when the Parish Council were asked to submit ideas for Road Safety improvements to WCC. Cllr. Mrs Wyatt asked why it hadn’t been re-addressed. The Clerk informed that following several weeks of chasing up the issue with WCC some months back, it had been confirmed that double white lines on the A428 would not be installed. The Clerk further explained the reason given behind the decision to Cllr. Mrs Wyatt i.e. that there were others areas where the money was needed to be spent, which were deemed more dangerous and where more accidents had occurred. Cllr. Mrs Wyatt re stated that the issue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
should be re-addressed. Chairman Cllr. Mr Rye asked Cllr. Mrs Wyatt what she was proposing. Cllr. Mrs Wyatt responded "I am proposing that the issue of double white lines on the A428 into Livingstone Avenue be re-addressed or does the Clerk rule what this Parish does?" Chairman Cllr. Mr Rye responded that a question had been asked, the Clerk had responded with the information requested, it was clarified to Cllr. Mrs Wyatt what the Clerk had said. Chairman Cllr. Mr Rye requested that no further comments be made against the Clerk. Cllr. Mrs Wyatt proposed that the double white lines on the A428 into Livingstone Avenue be re-addressed. Not seconded, no other comments were made.

k) Recreation Grounds

a) To Consider Lawford Heath Playing Field, Valuation to Purchase — The Clerk informed that an offer letter to purchase the playing field, as proposed and agreed at December’s meeting had been sent to RBC. A reply had been received informing that the offer letter had been received and RBC would respond in due course.

b) RoSPA Report — Cllr. Mr Cleton informed that he had spoken with the handyman who had confirmed that a start had been made on the items for repair on the RoSPA report, most of which were completed. There was to be a further discussion in a couple of days to ascertain what to do about outstanding repairs which needed further investigation.

B. Play and Leisure Group

a) 106 Agreement Play Equipment Update — It was informed that procedure followed to-date had been incorrect. Quotes should have been obtained through ESPO, this had resulted in three new quotes needing to be obtained through ESPO. As the Council had spent so much time looking at equipment based on what was originally favoured by Parishioners, it was proposed, seconded and agreed by all to stick with the original proposal of purchase without the need for any further committee or Parish Council meetings to decide or change plans from what had been voted for and agreed to purchase previously. The Question was asked about progress on the Noise Assessment. The Clerk to progress.

D) Transport, Highways, Drains and Street Lighting

- Cllr. Mrs Slack informed of a problem with a Street Light and would provide the location.
- CCllr. Mr Hodkinson commented that concerns had been highlighted regarding the white line marking on Lawford Heath Lane. He will report back on the matter.
- Cllr. Mrs Wyatt reported the footpath in School Street next to the playing field and informed that she had a photograph. The Clerk requested that the photograph be forwarded when it would be reported to WCC.

09-01/10

12. To Receive Details of Financial Matters

a) To Receive and Approve Accounts for Payment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>CHQ NO.</th>
<th>ISSUED TO</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.12.08</td>
<td>1682</td>
<td>LL Memorial Hall Rent Jan08-Dec08</td>
<td>£154.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.1.09</td>
<td>1683/4/5/6</td>
<td>Confidential</td>
<td>£1,607.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.1.09</td>
<td>1687</td>
<td>Confidential</td>
<td>£75.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.1.09</td>
<td>1688</td>
<td>Telecoms Jan 09</td>
<td>£23.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.1.09</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>Petty Cash Vouchers 98-101</td>
<td>£20.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.1.09</td>
<td>1690</td>
<td>HMRC Tax &amp; NI due Jan 09</td>
<td>£269.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.1.09</td>
<td>1691</td>
<td>The Information Commissioner</td>
<td>£35.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.1.09</td>
<td>1692</td>
<td>E.On St Lighting 1 Oct – 31 Dec 08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total January 2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£1,229.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>December</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank</td>
<td>Balance</td>
<td>£29,610.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at 31st</td>
<td>December</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/01/11</td>
<td>To Receive Details of Planning Matters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>R08/1856/PLN – Erection of a replacement dwelling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Croft, Back Lane, Rugby, CV23 9AX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Observations Made</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>R08/1827/PLN – Provision of a canopy for use as a smoking shelter and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>provision of an additional entrance door.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Long Lawford British Legion, 13 West Street, Long Lawford, CV23 9BJ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Observations Made</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rugley</td>
<td>Borough</td>
<td>Council have approved permission for the development referred to below.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Council</td>
<td>1. R08/1698/PLN – Erection of a detached dwelling and associated workd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>have</td>
<td>approved permission for the development referred to below.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>approval</td>
<td>(resubmission)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>for the</td>
<td>development referred to below.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/01/12</td>
<td>To Receive Items of Correspondence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Council Tax Base 09/10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Wicksteed Leisure Acceptance of quotes self closing gate and replacement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>swings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Pumping Station Back Lane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Parish Precept Request RBC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>NALC Regional Seminar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>P Wyatt Declaration of Interest Update</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>P Wyatt Declaration of Interest Update (Repeat)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>P Wyatt Declaration of Interest – Request for new form to be completed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blank form sent to P Wyatt to be completed by RBC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>RBC re P Wyatt New Blank form sent to P Wyatt to be completed by RBC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Offer letter to purchase land @ Ryelands RBC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Parish Precept and breakdown Long Lawford &amp; Little Lawford</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Code of Practice – Publicity and Consultation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Wicksteed Leisure acknowledgement of order and parts re 2. above.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Legal Briefing Power of Promotion of Well Being</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Acknowledgement of letter to RBC re land purchase @ Ryelands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>RBC information re play area inspections of RBC sites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>cc e-mail from C-Watson to RBC re 106 Equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Request for tender for grass cutting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Letter &amp; CV from Applicant for Councillor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/01/13</td>
<td>To Receive Reports on Minor Matters and Items for Future Agenda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| The Clerk informed that after speaking with and receiving an e-mail from the Monitoring Officer at RBC, Cllr. Mrs Wyatt was reminded of her need to fill out a new Declaration of Interest form and pointed out that to add items and to re-date a declaration of interest form currently in force dated December 08 and to simply re-date it would be unacceptable. Blank forms had been sent to Cllr. Mrs Wyatt from the Clerk and the Monitoring Officer at RBC for updating mid December. Cllr. Mrs Wyatt asked the Clerk to show proof of the above-mentioned e-mail reportedly having been received from the Monitoring Officer at RBC and sent to the Clerk. The Clerk informed that the e-
mail was listed in the correspondence list and was available for inspection. The Clerk requested that the Chairman clarify to Cllr. Mrs Wyatt what was being requested. This was clarified by the Chairman. Cllr. Mrs Wyatt commented that she would first speak with the Monitoring Officer. A potential new Councillor was introduced to the Council who spoke for a while on why they wished to become a Parish Councillor. The Clerk informed that a further application had been received. It was decided to invite the other applicant to the February 2009 Parish Council meeting after which the Council could vote and co-opt a new Councillor.

It was reported that manure had been left and not cleared up at the top of Clayhill Lane. The Borough Council to be contacted if it happens again.

Cllr. Mrs Wyatt reported litter problems on Lawford Heath Lane, A428, Townsend Lane and Baileys Lane. Chairman Cllr. Mr Rye commented that as the Parish is part of the Litter Pilot Scheme this could be reported to RBC.

Cllr. Mr Cleton reported receiving complaints regarding the new bus stop location on Townsend Lane and the lack of room to manoeuvre around the pole in a wheelchair, this was causing a need for people to go into the road. This would be addressed.

Cllr. Mr Cleton referred to BCllrs. Mrs Bragg and Mrs Watson report regarding camera equipment and pointed out that Cameras have only been agreed in principle. The question should be asked if it will cost the Parish Council, more information should be available before any agreement is reached.

Date and Time of the Next Meeting

It was confirmed by the Chairman that the next meeting is scheduled for Tuesday 10th February 09 at the earlier time of 7.15pm (due to the presentation of New Recycling Bins) in the Memorial Hall, Long Lawford. Meeting was declared closed at 9.55pm

Signed: .......................................................... Date: ..........................................................
Mr K Rye
Chairman
CODE OF CONDUCT COMPLAINT – COUNCILLOR MRS P WYATT OF LONG LAWFORD PARISH COUNCIL

NOTES OF MEETING WITH MISS D GROVES – COMPLAINANT AND CLERK TO LONG LAWFORD PARISH COUNCIL

DATE : 16TH March 2010

Miss Groves (DG) has been Clerk to the Parish Council since February 2007. It was a position she really enjoyed and took pride in her work, but the effect of Councillor Mrs Wyatt’s behaviour towards her was damaging to her confidence, her self-esteem and her health. She regarded herself as a strong and confident person, and her past employment history abroad with the European Commission and in the United States and in London, which she related to me, was testimony to this. But because of Mrs Wyatt constantly challenging what the Clerk said at meetings; questioning her honesty and integrity; always requiring proof of things done, advice received and letters or e-mails sent or received, she attended Parish Council meetings with “knots in her stomach” and usually came home with a headache. DG said that she knew from her conversations with past Clerks and former parish councillors, that many had left the Council because of Mrs Wyatt’s behaviour.

DG had provided details of Mrs Wyatt’s actions inside and outside of meetings in Minutes of meetings and copy e-mails. The use of capital letters in Mrs Wyatt’s e-mails to emphasise points and statements were taken to indicate rude and aggressive tones. Challenges she made to the accuracy of Minutes were invariably made in a rude, discourteous and demeaning manner. Such attitudes were not targeted only at the Clerk, but the Chairman also whenever she was challenged or corrected from the Chair. DG said that in a sense it was not personal towards DG herself (though, of course, it was) but that all Clerks or Chairmen had been treated in the same way if they did not submit to or agree with Mrs Wyatt’s wishes or designs.

DG cited the example of an occasion when the main Post Office in Rugby was closed for a half day and when parishioners complained to Mrs Wyatt she insisted that the Clerk should contact the Post Office to find out why. She regarded the Clerk as being at her “beck and call” and would not accept it when told by the Clerk or the Chairman, that the Clerk was there to serve the whole Council and not individual councillors and that individual councillors had no right to give instructions to the Clerk or any employee of the Parish Council.

DG said she had worked hard to establish sound professional and administrative practices in managing the affairs of the Council and she prided herself on that and on what the Council was beginning to achieve. She showed me three documents that she had produced and issued to all councillors on the roles of Councillors, the Chairman of the Council and the Clerk. She provided me with copies of the monthly list of expenditure which she provided at every Parish Council meeting before cheques were signed for payment. Every quarter she submitted a Bank Reconciliation report to the Parish Council meeting.

Mrs Wyatt’s open and public criticism of the Clerk at meetings were always harsh but never credible, and she was never supported in them by her fellow councillors. She would never accept the Clerk’s advice on standing orders or her answers to points of order which she raised. Even when the Chairman had asked the Clerk to respond or advise, Mrs Wyatt would put her down and say she was
asking the Chairman not the Clerk. She would demean the Clerk by asking “who was running the Council”. She would challenge the Clerk over matters that were obviously untrue. She denied receiving minutes in November and agenda in December and January, for example. The Clerk always hand delivered the agenda for meetings. She posted out the minutes of meetings once they had been finalised. In November she had included with the minutes an A3 plan of the landscaping proposals for the Park and Recreation Ground, but she had underpaid the postage. She contacted all members to ascertain whether they had received or collected them. For those members who had not or whom she had not been able to contact (like Mrs Wyatt), DG hand delivered fresh copies of the minutes and the plan.

Long Lawford was a small village community and people got to know of the criticisms of the Clerk by Mrs Wyatt. Mrs Wyatt had on a number of occasions openly raised the question of the payment of the monthly broadband charge for the Clerk when the list of expenditure was submitted at meetings and continued to do so despite being told by the Chairman that details of the Clerk’s terms and conditions of employment were not to be raised or discussed at public meetings of the Council.

DG explained the purpose of Rugby in Plume of which Mrs Wyatt was a member. It was an action group or watchdog which monitored the operations and activities of Cemex, the cement company in Rugby. It was an unofficial group. Mrs Wyatt included her membership in her Register of Financial and Other Interests but during the period from February 2007 until March 2009, when there had been a few planning applications by Cemex she did not declare either a personal or prejudicial interest and she had proposed objections herself. Since March 2009 she would declare a personal interest only at the commencement of meetings when items concerning Cemex were on the agenda. There had been a couple of planning applications since that time. However, DG gave examples of occasions when Mrs Wyatt would speak against Cemex and when considering planning applications, for example, would even propose objections to the applications. On these occasions DG believed Mrs Wyatt should have declared prejudicial interests also and left the meetings.

DG also said that Mrs Wyatt was Rugby Area Committee/WALC representative on the Rugby Cement Community Forum and Tyre Burning Group. DG felt this was wrong given her membership of Rugby in Plume and the fact that she was not the official representative of the Parish council on the Rugby Area Committee of WALC. These were declared on her Register of Interests form.

DG also cited examples where she believed Mrs Wyatt should have declared prejudicial interests when matters of interest to the Livingstone Avenue Householders’ Association, of which she was Secretary and Treasurer, were considered. Mrs Wyatt was a resident of Livingstone Avenue yet she made proposals regarding Livingstone Avenue. Prior to 2009 she did not declare personal or prejudicial interests when matters affecting Livingstone Avenue were discussed.

I explored the claim by DG that Mrs Wyatt had attempted to compromise her impartiality, as Clerk, in matters concerning Cemex and Rugby in Plume. DG said that Mrs Wyatt was constantly trying to get her to record or not record matters concerning Cemex in ways which would either be damaging to them or be advantageous to Rugby in Plume. After her appointment as Clerk, she found that Mrs Wyatt’s attitude towards her changed for the worse once it became clear to Mrs Wyatt that she would only act in an unbiased and correct manner in all matters, and that she would not accept whatever Mrs Wyatt was saying regardless. Many of the challenges and conflicts at Council meetings involving Mrs Wyatt were over minutes of what was or was not said regarding Cemex or Livingstone
Avenue affairs. They were never supported by Mrs Wyatt’s fellow colleagues. They occurred constantly at meetings and invariably added an hour on to the length of meetings. They were the cause of many councillors giving up their seats.

DG had also cited in her complaints the occasion when Mrs Wyatt, immediately after a Council meeting, had forwarded to a colleague on Rugby in Plume, Mrs Pallikaropoulos, a copy of what were at that stage only provisional comments and objections by the Parish Council regarding a planning application by Cemex. Mrs Pallikaropoulos in turn forwarded them to the local press as the Parish Council’s approved views. This again was an example of Mrs Wyatt trying to gain an advantage for Rugby in Plume and putting Cemex at a disadvantage.

In the course of our meeting, DG asked if I was also investigating 2 other sets of complaints which had been sent to the Monitoring Officer about Mrs Wyatt. One from DG again dated 12 February 2009 which had been considered by the Assessment Sub-Committee in August 2009 and another dated 13th October 2009 submitted jointly by DG and 5 councillors, but which had not been acknowledged as yet. I advised DG that I was unaware of these complaints but that I would raise them with the Monitoring Officer.

Prior to our meeting, I had asked DG if she could let me have a copy of Mrs Wyatt’s Declaration of Acceptance of Office following her election in May 2006, which would have incorporated the undertaking to observe/abide by the councillors’ code of conduct. DG had advised me that she did not have such records for that time. At our meeting, DG advised me that she had since contacted the 3 remaining councillors who were elected in 2006 (including Mrs Wyatt) asking if they could recall signing their Declarations of Acceptance of Office. Two of the members had replied saying they definitely did sign the Declaration; one, the Vice-Chairman, also recalling that he signed another declaration of acceptance of the office of Vice-Chairman. Mrs Wyatt had replied saying she could not possibly remember and asking what the other two members’ recollections were and whether there might be a record in the minutes, which DG confirmed there wasn’t. DG had also contacted the former Clerk and she confirmed categorically that all the members had signed their declarations of acceptance of office. DG indicated that when she received the Parish Council records on her appointment in 2007, they were handed over in an apple box and they were in a mess. There had been three acting clerks in the interim period and so she was not surprised that records were missing.

DG had provided me with contact details for the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Parish Council and a former Chairman, Mr Draper, who was chairman when the events complained of took place, but who had resigned from the Council soon afterwards. DG advised that the Vice-Chairman, Cllr Davison, had told her that if it was convenient to meet on the coming Thursday, he was off work that day and so it would be convenient for him. I undertook to contact Cllr Davison and thanked DG for her help in these matters and for providing those contact details.

Kevin Douglas

Independent Investigator

17th March 2010
CODE OF CONDUCT COMPLAINT – COUNCILLOR MRS P WYATT

NOTES OF MEETING WITH COUNCILLOR MARK DAVISON, VICE-CHAIRMAN OF LONG LAWFORD PARISH COUNCIL

18TH MARCH 2010

Councillor Davison (MD) advised that he had served on the Parish Council since October 2001. In response to my enquiry about the signing of Declarations of Acceptance of office after the May 2006 election, MD confirmed categorically that he and all the elected councillors had signed their Declarations before the start of the Annual Parish Council meeting and that he had subsequently signed a Declaration of Acceptance of Office in respect of his appointment as Vice-Chairman.

MD told me that the Parish Council were concerned that the complaints made against Councillor Mrs Wyatt had not been dealt with much sooner along with the further complaints which were submitted in February 2009 and October 2009. Mrs Wyatt’s conduct towards the Clerk had effectively been allowed to continue in exactly the same way because no action had been taken regarding the complaints.

Asked to describe Mrs Wyatt’s conduct towards the Clerk, MD reported that Mrs Wyatt was continually trying to tell the Clerk how to do her job and saying what she was doing wrong (in her opinion). She considered her opinion to be gospel. She as good as called the Clerk, and him and the Chairman, liars by denying things that had been said or not said at meetings or questioning actions that had been taken. She had always behaved this way and he was convinced that there were past Clerks who have resigned because of her.

She constantly criticised the Clerk publicly in meetings by challenging the accuracy of her minutes even down to spelling mistakes and punctuation. MD believed that by not going through the correct channels, Mrs Wyatt was deliberately bullying and trying to intimidate and demean the Clerk. By raising questions about payments to the Clerk for broadband and anti-virus subscriptions in public she was directly attacking the Clerk, humiliating her, and did so meeting after meeting despite the Chairman ruling her out of order and telling her not to raise issues regarding the Clerk’s terms and conditions in public meetings.

She would deny receiving copies of minutes and agenda, again as a way of criticising the Clerk, despite every other member of the Council having received theirs.

With regard to Mrs Wyatt sending a copy of his notes regarding a Cemex planning application to a colleague in the Rugby in Plume group, Mrs Lilian Pallikaropoulos, MD accepted that the notes were not marked “confidential” but said that they were not at that point in time the approved comments of the Parish Council in respect of the planning application, as they were said to be when the Rugby in Plume member forwarded them to the editor of the local newspaper. The comments he had included in his note were accepted by the Parish Council but they were not the final comments because the Parish Council wanted other members to have the opportunity of adding further comments, which were due to come back to the next meeting for final approval. MD described Rugby in Plume as a “hate group” against Cemex, the cement works. They monitored such things as emissions and the number of wagons entering and leaving the works and considered and made objections to their planning applications. It was not a formal body. Mrs Wyatt was a member in her
own right not as a representative of the Parish Council. At Council meetings she took part in discussions about Cemex and pushed for action against them. If no one would make a proposal for action she wanted, she would propose it herself. In sending his comments to the Parish Council meeting to Rugby in Plume, MD believed Mrs Wyatt was clearly trying to put Rugby in Plume in an advantageous position in support of their objections to the planning application. The cement works had existed in Rugby since 1880.

Lilian Pallikaropoulos was the leading light in Rugby in Plume and had disrupted Parish Council meetings in the past. The former Chairman of the Parish Council had stood up against her and Rugby in Plume and he was more or less hounded out of the Council by them.

MD also gave as an example of Mrs Wyatt failing to declare interests at meetings, her position as a member of the Livingstone Avenue Residents’ Association. A piece of land which adjoined her property was the subject of an ownership dispute between the Parish Council and the Residents’ Association. The Council wanted to do something with the land. The Residents’ Association and Mrs Wyatt wanted nothing done to it. Up to 2009 she didn’t declare an interest at all. The land in question is still claimed by both the Parish Council and the Residents’ Association. Although she now declared a personal interest at meetings when the matter was discussed, she did not declare a prejudicial interest and she stayed and took part in meetings.

MD said that Mrs Wyatt’s bad behaviour towards the Clerk and at Council meetings generally was so bad that in October last year another complaint, this time signed by the Clerk and all but one of the other councillors on the Parish Council, was sent to the Monitoring officer at Rugby BC. There were currently 7 Parish Council members, including Mrs Wyatt, with 3 vacancies.

Kevin J Douglas – Independent Investigator

22-03-2010
CODE OF CONDUCT COMPLAINT – COUNCILLOR MRS P WYATT

NOTES OF MEETING WITH COUNCILLOR KEITH RYE - CHAIRMAN OF LONG LAWFORD PARISH COUNCIL

18TH MARCH 2010

Councillor Rye (KR) advised that he had served on the Parish Council since late 2006; 2 or 3 months before Debbie Groves’ appointment as Clerk in February 2007. He expressed his opinion that Debbie Groves was doing an excellent job as Clerk. She came in at a difficult time. There were numerous things that were not being done correctly. She had brought things up to date and implemented correct procedures. Unfortunately Mrs Wyatt, he said, took exception to this. She had had carte-blanche over the way things were done for years and she didn’t like to be curtailed by proper procedure. As a result she continually challenged the Clerk month after month about the accuracy of minutes – petty issues, like grammatical mistakes, but also issues about what was and was not said and recorded or not recorded. She would challenge the Clerk’s advice on procedures and information that she had been provided with for the Council; wanting proof of what advice she had received or what action she had taken. She constantly attacked the Clerk’s ability and her integrity; even over issues like the receipt of minutes and agenda. This was very wearing for the Clerk and had affected her confidence.

KR was concerned at the length of time it had taken for the complaints against Mrs Wyatt to be investigated. Two more complaints had been made to the Monitoring Officer and these had not been progressed. The Parish Council was concerned and had discussed it at their last meeting and instructed him to write to the Chief Executive of Rugby BC protesting. (I asked KR whether Mrs Wyatt was present at that meeting and had she left the meeting during the discussion. He said that she did leave the meeting, but reluctantly and only after he had challenged her, otherwise she would have remained.)

He said not only had the Clerk been left in a very vulnerable position whilst these complaints remained unresolved, but the Parish Council itself were at risk of being accused of not taking their duty of care towards the Clerk seriously and, as her employer, potentially having a constructive dismissal case against them if the Clerk ever decided that enough was enough and resigned.

KR said that the Parish Council had begun to achieve things in the last couple of years, like the improvements to the King George Vth Recreation Ground and the purchase of the recreation land at The Rylands. In the past the Parish Council had done nothing. That was how Mrs Wyatt wanted it to continue and she objected to the new ways that the Clerk had introduced and took every opportunity to put her down. She also wanted the Clerk to do things for her that were not her responsibility, like contacting the Post Office in Rugby to find out why it had been closed for a day, after Mrs Wyatt had received a complaint from a parishioner. KR had told Mrs Wyatt that it was for her to contact the Post Office over a matter like that, not the Clerk. Mrs Wyatt had retorted “And it’s not for you to tell me what to do”.

Mrs Wyatt, he said, had a one-track mind and was obsessed with the cement works, Cemex. The works were not within the Parish Boundary and he was for ever having to tell Mrs Wyatt that there were only a limited number of issues that it was legitimate for the Parish Council to consider where
Cemex was concerned. The previous Chairman, David Draper, had tried to get Mrs Wyatt to tone things down and to control Lilian Pallikaropoulos's (Mrs Wyatt's close associate on Rugby in Plume) contributions and interventions at Council meetings. But they accused him of being biased; that he was a former employee of Cemex; and they lodged Code of Conduct complaints against him. In the end he resigned from the Council.

Mrs Wyatt was very disruptive at meetings. KR had written to her advising her that she must read her agenda before meetings and focus on the items under discussion at any particular time. She would accuse the Clerk of not putting items she had requested on the agenda, only to be told that they were included later on the agenda. She would try to return to items after they had been determined because she hadn't paid attention. The effect of her constant challenges to the Clerk and the Chairman would be to add an hour on to every meeting that she attended. In the past 12 months, good councillors had resigned and he was convinced the main reason was out of frustration over Mrs Wyatt’s conduct at meetings.

KR confirmed that there were many occasions where Mrs Wyatt had remained and taken part in meetings when items concerning Cemex and the Livingstone Avenue were under discussion and where she would have declared a personal interest but not a prejudicial interest.

As regards the document with comments on the Cemex planning application which was passed over to Lilian Pallikaropoulos, KR said that Mrs Wyatt would never admit to having sent that document. He had seen an e-mail from the editor of the local newspaper, however, which made it clear that Mrs Pallikaropoulos had received the document from a member of the Parish Council. KR had written to each member of the Council asking them to say whether or not they had sent the document. All the members bar Mrs Wyatt replied saying they had not. Mrs Wyatt would not confirm or deny it.

KR said he thought the motivation for Mrs Wyatt raising the payment of the Clerk's allowance for broadband at her home, which was the Parish Council’s office in effect, was to both embarrass the Clerk by raising it in public and to challenge the need for it. Mrs Wyatt had for a long time wanted the Parish Council to have an office in the Memorial Hall. The Council had a room in the Hall where its records were stored, but the Trustees would not allow a telephone line and so it could not be used as an office.

KR confirmed that there were usually at least one or two members of the public at every parish Council meeting. Mrs Wyatt's conduct towards the Clerk and generally at such public meetings were of great concern to him and his members.

Kevin J Douglas – Independent Investigator

22-03-2010
NOTE OF TELEPHONE INTERVIEW ON 24/03/10 WITH MRS DAVID DRAPER, FORMER PARISH CHAIRMAN OF LONG LAWFORD PARISH COUNCIL

Mr Draper said he had resigned as Chairman of the Parish Council and as a Parish Councillor because of the actions and behaviour of Mrs Wyatt and Mrs Lilian Palliairopoulos who had submitted totally unfounded complaints against him to the Standards Committee of Rugby Borough Council. The complaints were eventually rejected.

He stated that it was very difficult to control Mrs Wyatt in meetings of the Parish Council and she was always trying to get the Clerk to do things that were unreasonable. He wrote to Mrs Wyatt after the occasion when she copied the Vice-Chairman’s note on the Cemex planning application to Mrs Palliairopoulos regarding her disruptive influence at meetings – holding conversations in the background; passing notes to Mrs Wyatt. He asked Mrs Wyatt to refrain from sending copies of Parish Council correspondence to Mrs Palliairopoulos; to discourage her from attending Parish Council meetings, particularly as she was not a parishioner; and for Mrs Wyatt to help speed up proceedings at Parish Council meetings by refraining from raising trivial matters and by summarising her contributions. Her constant disruptions at Parish Council meetings were bringing the Parish Council into disrepute.

Mr Draper described Mrs Wyatt as a very difficult person, though well-meaning. That was the way she was. She was opposed to the Parish Council doing anything and so she opposed everything or abstained.

She had interests in Rugby in Plume and Cemex planning applications. She would declare personal interests but despite her interest would stay in meetings and propose objections.

Mr Draper said that Mrs Wyatt was on the Finance Committee and could have raised confidential matters about payments, such as the Clerk’s broadband payments, there, in private. But she didn’t attend and used to raise private issues in Parish Council meetings, when there were always one or two members of the public present.

Mr Draper confirmed that he and all councillors had signed their Declarations of Acceptance of Office after the elections in 2006. He had his own copy in his records.

Mr Draper concluded by commenting that he didn’t know why Mrs Wyatt carried on as a parish councillor – she should have stood down as he had done.
NOTE OF TELEPHONE INTERVIEW ON 24/03/10 WITH MRS JEAN TAYLOR, FORMER CLERK TO LONG LAWFORD PARISH COUNCIL

With regard to the signing of their Declarations of Acceptance of Office after the 2006 elections, Mrs Taylor confirmed that all members would have signed them. She was well aware of the procedures and their importance and applied them properly. She had been Clerk to the School Governors since 1971 so she had experience in such a role.

Mrs Taylor said she only did one year as Clerk to the Parish Council. She left because she didn’t seem to be able to do anything right in Mrs Wyatt’s eyes. She was always challenging the Chairman and her, as Clerk. She had known Mrs Wyatt since 1971. Their daughters were the same age and went to the same school. She had always thought of Mrs Wyatt as a friend. But when she was acting as a parish councillor she was wearing a different hat. Mrs Taylor said she was really a very good person but didn’t realise the effect she has on people. Anyone who is Clerk receives the same treatment, so in a sense it was not personal, but it was very wearing. The former Chairman, David Draper had great difficulty with her.

It was almost like she had a split personality. She could do a lot of good. Mrs Taylor said she felt sorry for her.
CODE OF CONDUCT COMPLAINT AGAINST COUNCILLOR MRS P WYATT OF LONG LAWFORD PARISH COUNCIL BY MS D GROVES

NOTES OF MEETINGS WITH CLLR MRS WYATT HELD ON 26TH AND 31ST MARCH 2010

(Also present was Mr A Roper, a friend of Mrs Wyatt.)

At the commencement I advised Mrs Wyatt that I had been appointed to investigate the complaints made against her in November 2008 by Ms D Groves, the Clerk to Long Lawford Parish Council. I was unable to explain why it had taken so long to commence the investigation, except that it had initially been referred to the Standards Board for England by the Assessment Sub-Committee because of Mrs Wyatt’s membership of Rugby BC Standards Committee and it had been referred back by SBE for local investigation. I explained that I was aware that other complaints under the Code of Conduct had been made against her in February 2009 by Ms Groves and in October 2009 by the Clerk and other Parish Council members, but I had not been instructed to investigate these complaints.

Mrs Wyatt said that she was aware of the February 2009 complaint. She had been advised by the Monitoring Officer that the Assessment sub-Committee had referred only one part of that complaint for investigation and that, again, it had been referred to the Standards Board for England. She had not heard anymore about either the November 2008 or the February 2009 complaints. Moreover, she was not aware of a complaint made against her in October 2009 and she asked if she could know the details of the complaint. I apologised and explained that I could not provide such details and that if I had known that she was unaware of that complaint, I would not have mentioned it.

Mrs Wyatt said that she would not receive any notification until the complaint(s) had been processed by the local authority and assessed. She had requested in writing and verbally copies of the confidential minutes of Parish Council meetings about complaints to the Monitoring Officer but the Clerk and the Chairman had stated publicly that she couldn’t have them because they were about her.

By way of background, Mrs Wyatt advised that she had been a member of Long Lawford Parish Council for something like 30 years. She was a member of Rugby Borough Council from 2002 to 2006.

I explained to Mrs Wyatt that after some detailed searching by the Clerk to the Parish Council, her Declaration of Acceptance of Office following her election to the Parish Council in May 2006 had been found and I had a copy of it. The Declaration included Mrs Wyatt’s undertaking to observe the Councillors’ Code of Conduct. I also advised her that the Monitoring Officer, Mrs Bradford, had provided me with a copy of her latest, updated entries in the Register of Interests, dated 14th and 17th December 2008. Mrs Wyatt asked me if I had a copy of the subsequent typed version of her Register of interests entry of January 2009. The Clerk, she said, had required her to fill in a completely new form because she said the updated version of the 14th and 17th December was not valid. Mrs Wyatt said she had done this despite being advised by the Monitoring Officer that her
valid. Mrs Wyatt said she had done this despite being advised by the Monitoring Officer that her amended version of 14th and 17th December was in order. Because of this, she had asked to see the contrary advice that the Clerk said she had received from the Monitoring Officer.

Mrs Wyatt said she was being criticised by the Clerk for querying the accuracy of the minutes of Council meetings. But every time she challenged the Minutes, she said the Clerk jumped down on her. She said she did not regard that as bullying the Clerk especially when the minutes did not reflect what she recalled as being the correct record.

The Parish Council meeting on 14th October 2008 considered the Cemex climafuel application. The Parish Council received comments from Councillor Davison, the Vice-Chairman, on the application and considered his proposal to make objections. His comments and objections were approved on the night because of the time limit on submitting the Parish Council’s comments to the County Council. Mrs Wyatt said she was delighted that the Parish Council had agreed to the objections. She asked Cllr Davison for a copy of his note, which he had read out and spoken to at the meeting. She and the public who were present were jubilant at the decision and as far as she and they were aware, that was the Council’s formal decision. A vote had been taken – all in favour with one abstention. The eventual minutes, however, did not reflect this. The minutes showed that the agreed objections would be circulated to the members of the Council so that any other points they wished to make could be added, and then the final version would be brought to the November meeting for approval. Mrs Wyatt was adamant that this was not the decision. The decision to object had been made on the night. [Mr Roper said he was present at the meeting that evening and he agreed that the decision to send in objections to the application was definitely made on that night.] Mrs Wyatt said that as a result she challenged the accuracy of the minutes at the November meeting of the Council.

The complaint by the Clerk against Mrs Wyatt maintained that she had used her position as a councillor improperly by passing on to Mrs Lilian Palikaropoulos, a fellow member of Rugby in Plume, a copy of Cllr Davison’s note and advising that the Council had decided that night to submit objections based on those outlined in the note, which Mrs Palikaropoulos in turn relayed to the local newspaper. Mrs Wyatt maintained that the decision was taken on the night. After the meeting Mrs Palikaropoulos had telephoned her to ask her to confirm what the objections had been at the meeting, which she told her. Mrs P asked if she could have a copy of the wording and, since the document was not marked private and confidential, she sent her a copy.

Mrs Wyatt explained that Rugby in Plume was a group interested in protecting the people and the environment from pollution arising from the Cement Works in Rugby. Mrs Wyatt was a member in her own right. Mrs P was the leading member and she had attended meetings of the Parish Council in the past when issues concerning the Cement Works needed to be addressed or were to be considered. She was challenged by a previous Chairman over her right to attend the Parish Council meetings and to speak as a member of the public. The Chairman had maintained that she had to be a member of the Parish but Mrs Wyatt maintained that any member of the public could attend and she had had this confirmed by Warwickshire Association of Local Councils (WALC).

Mrs Wyatt commented on the issue that had arisen over her request for the Parish Council to put forward again the case for double white lines on the main road opposite the entrance to Livingstone Avenue. The Clerk had pooh-poohed it saying the County Council had advised that it wasn’t a priority
and therefore could not be put forward again. Mrs Wyatt believed it should have been and out of frustration had commented “was the Clerk running the Council”. In her own capacity, Mrs Wyatt said that she had continued to press the County Council on the matter and had now got a favourable response. In her view, the Parish Council could have continued to press for it itself.

Mrs Wyatt also cited the issue of the closure of the main Post Office in Rugby one day as an example of how defensive the Clerk and the Chairman were towards her. She claimed that she had simply asked whether the Parish Council had received notice from the Post Office of the closure, not, as the Clerk claimed, that she had asked her to find out why the Post Office was closed. For this the Chairman had admonished Mrs Wyatt and told her that the Clerk wasn’t there to serve Mrs Wyatt’s needs and demands.

The Clerk had maintained that Mrs Wyatt’s use of capital letters in e-mails she sent to her was intended to denote a tone which was bullying and threatening. Mrs Wyatt was perplexed by this claim. She said she often used capitals because of her sight. She had had a cataract operation.

The Clerk had cited the requests by Mrs Wyatt for copies of minutes and agenda which had either been posted to her (in the case of minutes) or hand delivered (in the case of agenda) as questioning her competency and her integrity and honesty. Recent e-mail exchanges over minutes and agenda for December 09 and January 10 and a letter from the Chairman were referred to by Mrs Wyatt. Mrs Wyatt explained that when she has asked for further copies of agenda and minutes, she was not intending to criticise the Clerk or to infer that they hadn’t been posted to her or hand delivered. It was just that she hadn’t been able to trace them. But Mrs Wyatt said there was an inconsistency over what the Clerk said about hand delivering the January agendas because she had sent an e-mail to all Councillors saying that because of the inclement weather she would not be able to hand deliver them and they would be e-mailed instead, with signed copies being brought to the meeting.

Mrs Wyatt said she felt there was a conspiracy by the Chairman and the Clerk against her because of the challenges she made. She recalled an inappropriate conversation with the Chairman when he said to her “if you think you’re going to get rid of me like you got rid of the last Chairman, then you’ve got another think coming” (sic). She also provided copies of recent e-mails from the Clerk which demonstrated a bad attitude towards her and were rude. She said she believed that because there were a number of new members on the Parish Council they were too new to challenge the Clerk’s conduct and attitude. But she supplied me with a copy of a statement from Borough Councillor Mrs Claire Watson, who had resigned as a member of the Parish Council the previous year, which commented on appalling behaviour by the Clerk and Chairman towards Mrs Wyatt and commended Mrs Wyatt for her service as a parish councillor. She also provided me with a copy of a letter from Mr Roper which recounted the proceedings of the 14th October 2008 meeting regarding the Cemex planning application and also on the conduct of the Clerk towards Mrs Wyatt. Mrs Wyatt also provided me with copies of three other letters or statements from persons commending Mrs Wyatt as a parish councillor and the work she has undertaken for parishioners over the years.

Another aspect of the complaint against Mrs Wyatt was that she had publicly raised issue with the monthly telecoms/broadband payment to the Clerk at the meeting of the Council on 14th October 2008, with members of the public present. The Clerk maintained that this was private and confidential information concerning her terms and conditions of employment and should not have been raised at a public meeting of the Council. The Chairman had ruled as such. Mrs Wyatt said that
also because Mrs Wyatt had wanted the Parish Council to consider having a web site. This was a condition of achieving Quality Parish Council status. She raised the matter because she wanted to make the point that public money was being used for the Clerk’s computer and e-mail facilities but the public were not benefitting from it.

Mrs Wyatt said the Clerk criticised her for challenging and questioning the accounts and invoices. But she saw herself in a scrutiny role and she was not happy with the procedures that the Clerk had introduced. She was a member of the Finance Sub Committee but meetings clashed with her meetings of the Rugby Cement Community Forum (RCCF). She had attended a meeting in June 2009 and had wanted to see the accounts and the invoices but was only shown the summary spreadsheet. She had challenged and asked for justification of additional payments made to the Clerk, but was told by the Clerk that these were part of her terms and conditions of employment and so she couldn’t challenge them.

Accounts and invoices were available before the start of the Parish Council meetings but there was not enough time to inspect them, because if one were to inspect them the start of the meeting would have to be delayed. Likewise the Correspondence List was made available before the meeting but with insufficient time to read it and she was not a quick reader. She had raised these issues as procedural matters but was put down. She had also raised the issue about agenda and minutes for Committee and Sub-Committee meetings and whether they should be held in public. The Finance meetings did not have an agenda and no minutes were kept. Mrs Wyatt said she no longer challenged these issues because she was too afraid of the Clerk and Chairman’s reactions. Mrs Wyatt commented that she had never seen any other member examine the invoices before any meeting commenced.

(Note: At this point it was agreed to adjourn the meeting to Wednesday 31st March)

Mrs Wyatt re-iterated her concern that the schedule of accounts was not provided in sufficient time at meetings to enable proper consideration. She had previously been a member of the Sub Finance Group before the present Clerk took office where invoices were calculated and checked against expenditure. Moreover, agenda and minutes were produced. When she was Chairman of the Council, all expenditure documentation was separately viewed and read by each member before payment was approved. She said she became a member of the Finance Sub-Committee after the former Chairman of the Council, Mr Draper, resigned from the Council. At the first meeting she attended she asked for information on the accounts and she was given 3 pieces of paper only. At her second meeting she asked to see the invoices. She said she was made to feel as if she wasn’t entitled to see them. All she wanted to do was to look at the invoices. The Clerk had asked the Chairman if she should show her the invoices because she had asked for them, and while Mrs Wyatt was looking at invoices, comments were being made by the Clerk along the lines of "Why are we paying for an Internal Auditor? Surely this is unnecessary if Councillor Wyatt is doing it". There were 4 members on the Finance Sub-Committee. There was no agenda for the meetings and no minutes. Meetings were convened by e-mail usually and were quite ad hoc. As an example of the business transacted, Mrs Wyatt said that at the June meeting the Clerk showed two illustrations of a shed for the Handyman and the Clerk wanted some sort of cupboard in her garden to store bleach etc for the Memorial Hall cleaner. These items were discussed but there was no report and no quotations. These matters were subsequently reported back to full Council but sometimes items came to the
These matters were subsequently reported back to full Council but sometimes items came to the Parish Council meeting which she had no previous knowledge of and that was why she often abstained from voting. If she was not sure of something then she would not participate in a vote.

Mrs Wyatt also related the problems she had over her requests to see the Parish Council accounts at the time of the Annual External Audit of Accounts. As far as she was concerned she applied in the correct way to inspect the accounts but she was told by the then Chairman that she didn’t. Then when she was told she could see the accounts she was given three pieces of paper and told that was all she was entitled to. She thought one was a letter from Clement Keys, the external auditors. Mrs Wyatt said she hadn’t seen the Accounts for 2007/08 or 2008/09. I referred to an e-mail from the Clerk in July 2007 in which the Clerk set out alternative dates and times in July 2007 when the accounts could be inspected by Mrs Wyatt in the Upstairs Room in the Memorial Hall. The e-mail is annotated by the Clerk to the effect that there was “No reply, didn’t arrange to come and view the accounts!”. Mrs Wyatt said that she did not recall receiving that e-mail. After our meeting Mrs Wyatt managed to locate the e-mail from the Clerk dated 13 July 2007. She said the subject of the e-mail was “Re: Finance Committee Meeting” which was to be held on the 5th July 2007 which was sent dated 3rd July 2007. Mrs Wyatt states that to this day she never knew of the arranged dates to inspect the accounts and could not understand why the dates would be placed at the bottom of an e-mail dated 13th July 2007 entitled Finance Committee Meeting, for which she had given apologies ten days earlier.

We spent some time examining in more detail the Clerk’s view that Mrs Wyatt used capital letters (both intermittently in some e-mails and fully in certain notes) to indicate a rudeness of tone or a bullying and intimidating manner. In particular, e-mails of the 15/07/08; 16/07/08; 06/10/08 and 07/10/08 were looked at. Also a Memorandum headed “From Mrs Patricia Wyatt 08.07.08 – Dear Councillors For Information” followed by proposed corrections to Minutes, all in capitals; and also Notes entitled “Reminder Notes for Parish Council 10th September 2008” – again, all in capitals. Mrs Wyatt said that in the e-mails she used capitals for certain words to emphasise or highlight them. They were not intended to be derogatory or to signify shouting or a raised voice. They were as much for her benefit, as the recipients’. This was certainly the case with the Memorandum to Councillors outlining proposed amendments to Minutes. The “Reminder Notes for Parish Council 10th September 2008” was her own aide-memoir and capitals were used throughout because of her eyesight and to assist her in reading the notes. The Clerk and others were provided with copies of these notes simply to assist them in following Mrs Wyatt’s points and to assist the Clerk with her notes. She was trying to be helpful. There was no intention to bully or intimidate anyone.

Mrs Wyatt was asked if she recalled shouting down the phone at the Clerk when she rang her on 15th July 2008 about wanting to inspect the accounts before they were sent to the external auditors. Mrs Wyatt did not recall shouting at the Clerk down the phone. Mrs Wyatt commented that she did get frustrated by all the trouble she had to go through first to get something that she believed she was entitled to. (Mr Roper interjected to say that Mrs Wyatt will sometimes shout down the phone at him out of frustration!) Mrs Wyatt has since said that she was unaware that she shouted at anyone down the phone. She said it might have something to do with a hearing disability and she did not realise that she was shouting – a matter she would try to be aware of in future.
Mrs Wyatt advised that she regularly attended training courses because she believed you can always learn and, for her personally, she liked to hear things two or three times over. She had also attended several Code of Conduct training courses both as a parish councillor and as a member of Rugby BC’s Standards Committee. She commented that she did not know if the Clerk had been on any training. She was only aware of one new councillor who had. The Chairman, Councillor Rye, she said, generally declined the opportunity of attending any training courses because of his work arrangements.

Mrs Wyatt commented on her membership of the WALC Area Committee. The Parish Council had appointed Cllr Mrs Slack at the last Annual Parish Council meeting to represent Long Lawford PC, though she had not attended any meetings since her appointment. WALC have advised her that the Parish Council was entitled to two voting representatives on the Area Committee and so they still regarded her as one of the appointed representatives, along with Cllr Mrs Slack. Mrs Wyatt said she was the only Parish Council representative to attend the Area Committee meetings and that this was also the case with the Rugby Cement Community Forum.

Mrs Wyatt said that she believed that much of the animosity towards her was to do with her understanding and involvement with the Cement works and that it had caused her a lot of hardship. In recent times she had been humiliated in Parish Council meetings. She was publicly challenged for supposedly revealing the Clerk’s e-mail address to the public, when in fact that information was regularly circulated in e-mails from various organisations and individuals. Then, at an extra-ordinary Parish Council meeting the previous evening (convened to consider a quotation for extra works at the Ryelands), the Clerk having given her some documents, openly called on other members to witness that she had given her the Dec 09 and Jan 10 minutes and agenda, which Mrs Wyatt had been asking for, and the March Council minutes. At the same meeting, other members had their Nomination Papers for the forthcoming Parish Elections in May. In the past the Clerk had provided these documents. Mrs Wyatt had not been given a set. When she enquired, she was advised that the members had obtained the Nomination papers themselves from Rugby BC offices. When she made her request for a set of Nomination Papers at Rugby Town Hall she was informed that more than ten sets had been sent to the Clerk.

At the December 2009 Parish Council meeting, there was a confidential item regarding complaints to the Standards Committee about Mrs Wyatt on the agenda. Mrs Wyatt said that on balance she decided that she should declare an interest which she did, and left the meeting. Similarly, at the March 2010 meeting, although the agenda did not reveal that the code of conduct complaints to be discussed related to her, once she became aware of that fact, she did declare her interest and left the meeting. Mrs Wyatt stated that she felt very much on her own at Parish Council meetings. New councillors had been influenced. Members of the public had commented to her on how badly and rudely she was treated in Council meetings.

With regard to the complaint that at the meeting of the Parish Council meeting on 11th November 2008 when the Cemex planning application was considered, she failed to declare a prejudicial interest and that she proposed objections to the application, Mrs Wyatt stated that she did not consider she had a prejudicial interest in the application. She had declared a personal interest as a member of Rugby in Plume but her interest in the Cemex application was, she believed, one that she shared with the public generally.
Mrs Wyatt said she was also aware of tensions over the payment by the Parish Council for maintenance of the strip of land adjoining Livingstone Avenue. Mrs Wyatt was Secretary and Treasurer of the Livingstone Avenue Residents Association and this was included in her Register of Interests. She produced a copy of a Conveyance dated 15th September 1969 under which there was a covenant placing a clear duty on the Parish Council to maintain the land etc.

Mrs Wyatt also commented that on 2nd February 2009 she had written to the Chairman of the Parish Council regarding her concerns over procedure within the Parish Council and her own efforts to bring about change.

Mrs Wyatt believed that all these issues were the cause of the negative attitude towards her within the Parish Council.

At the conclusion of the meeting, I advised Mrs Wyatt that I would chase up the situation regarding the other complaints against her and that although I was only instructed to investigate the November 2008 complaint, I had allowed the discussion at these meetings to range over the whole period up to the present day, because it seemed that all the events and all the complaints were intertwined.

Kevin J Douglas – Independent Investigator

14th April 2010
25th March 2010

I wish to convey my views on the conduct of the Clerk, Chairman and Councillors of Long Lawford Parish Council to Parish Councillor Mrs Patricia Wyatt.

I was a member of the Parish Council from March 2002 until January 2009 but still attend meetings in my capacity as County and Borough Councillor for Long Lawford.

Since the election of the existing Chairman, I have witnessed numerous occasions when the Clerk, the Chairman and other Councillors have been disrespectful and impatient when Cllr Mrs Wyatt has attempted to dispute a point of accuracy of the minutes or conforming to Standing Orders / Regulations.

There was a prime example at the March 2010 meeting when Cllr Mrs Wyatt was requesting more details on the financial income and expenditure. The Chairman challenged her that it was not required and when Cllr Mrs Wyatt counterchallenged that following her very recent training she felt that this should be made available The Chairman slammed his palm onto the table and told her to "Shut Up". He went on to say that if she persisted to interrupt the meeting she would be asked to leave.

Such behaviour, I and my fellow Borough Councillor felt, especially in front of a member of the public, was extremely disrespectful, demeaning and embarrassing to Cllr Mrs Wyatt.

There are times when Cllr Mrs Wyatt does take a few moments to get her point across; however, with her vast experience as a Parish Councillor I feel that the Clerk and Councillors should at least hear her point of view without interruption.

There have been numerous occasions when the Clerk has challenged Cllr Mrs Wyatt on her Declaration of Interests, which I feel are beyond her remit as Parish Clerk.

Cllr Mrs Claire Watson

County Councillor for Lawford & New Bilton
Borough Councillor for Lawford & King’s Newnham
15 South View Rd
Long Lawford
Rugby
Warwickshire
CV23 9BP
18 March 2010

To Whom It May Concern

I have been fortunate enough to have personally known Councillor Patricia Wyatt for the past 7 years. In 2003 I was directed towards Mrs Wyatt, to answer numerous queries I had about South View Road, Long Lawford, as my parents were purchasing a house there. What information she did not immediately have to hand, I was grateful to receive personally from her within a few days. She had gone out of her way to gain that factual information, regarding it being a private road and the implications regarding access and maintenance.

A year later I also moved to South View Rd.

In about 2007 there was enormous concern by the mainly elderly residents of South View Rd, when an issue over ownership of land adjacent to our properties arose. Mrs Wyatt went out of her way to bring the matter to a swift conclusion by organising a meeting with Rugby Council for me, and she also accompanied me to that meeting in her professional capacity as a Parish Councillor. She provided me with factual information and without her help, that issue would still have been unsolved.

In 2008, once again I sought Mrs Wyatt's help regarding an issue of excessive tree planting in front of South View Rd. She supported me and attended the subsequent meeting with the council, enabling the residents to come to a more acceptable tree planting scheme.

On several occasions she has assisted me in reporting issues of dust population to the relevant authorities, directing me towards the correct reporting procedure.

Mrs Wyatt is a passionate member of this community, she will endeavour to assist any one who has concerns. I have found her to be professional and knowledgeable, and throughout our acquaintance I have learnt that she takes the issue of confidentiality very seriously.

It never fails to impress me how Mrs Wyatt, despite her full schedule with the various committees she sits on, always has time to listen to and act upon the communities concerns, however minor they may be.

Mrs Wyatt is an asset to the Parish Council.

Yours Faithfully

Mrs Deborah Marchetti
Dear Mr. Wyatt,

As you know, I, along with many residents in Long
Bawford, including ex parish councillor, the Activist
District News reports, have ceased to attend Parish
Council Meetings. Several meetings I attended were
informative and interesting.

Informative?: Mr. M. Harrison had been afforded the
Task of investigating the massive Clinical fuel Application
file. He explained his understand with reference to
household waste, industrial waste, toxic waste being
delivered to Rugby, possibly to Malpas, from all over the county and from abroad. He expressed
concerns of additional vehicle traffic and the affects
of health and safety not just for Long Bawford but
the whole of the Rugby and beyond.

Consequently be proposed that the Parish Council
should reject the application accepted as a proposal
by the Chair, seconded, voted on, and all councillors
present, except one, voted in favour. This was never
reported as such in the clerks perception of the minutes
of that meeting. Minutes are not audio recorded but
must be approved at the following monthly meeting. But for
many times prior to approval, the Clerk has posted on the
village notice board and supplied, for interpretation to.

I have witnessed on several occasions that you, almost
incoherently challenged the correctness of our decisions.
and so you are the one, for some time now have been a target for removal.

I also remember of the P.C. now no longer a member, calling the Clerk to account for securing correspondence, replying to the said letter herself, and was reminded her position was as Clerk and was not a Parish Council Member and what she had done was illegal.

This of course was not recorded in the minutes.

You have my permission to present this letter, if needed, I am also prepared to attend and swear if required. Should you need the truth to be told!!

Yours faithfully,

[Signature]

[Date: 6th Nov.]

[Address: 25, Green Lane]

[Enclosure: Letter]

Ref: The Walsh Site, taken at the Meeting, accepted proposition.

The report to the Press, supplied by the Clerk, stated and published, stated "No formal decision was made at the meeting."

A decision was made, the Clerk has overruled the Chair and the Parish Councillors by her report.
23rd March 2010

To Whom It May Concern

Mrs Patricia Wyatt

Mrs Patricia Wyatt has been known to me since 2003, at which time she was the elected Councillor (Independent) for the area of Long Lawford, Rugby, Warwickshire. In my opinion, Mrs Wyatt has shown to be highly experienced in local politics, strictly dedicated to the electorate, is of watertight integrity, very frankly spoken, and free of any known conflicting interests. From my experiences, this Lady is endowed with a unique feature of cooling any overheated dispute, by simply pouring one cold fact over it, and thereby precluding any element of prejudice, but introducing the paramount factor of impartiality.

It is hereby declared, that I the undersigned Samuel John van Haefsen, as captioned above, am 76 years of age, born 16 January 1934, Bombay, India, a British Citizen, of Passport No. 453107321, Issued in the UK. And valid until 17 March 2013. I underwent 6 years of training, achieved a higher education, qualified as a Naval Engineering Officer, advancing to Surveyor of ships and Engineering. I have been stationed overseas since 1966, and served in the Middle East for the last 10 years, having witnessed the Iran Revolution, the 6 year Iran/Iraq war, the invasion of Kuwait, and thereafter retirement in Rugby 1991.

This testimony is based on factual events, in so far as can be remembered, or evidence which is held on record. The contents of this document in entirety, is intended to be without prejudice, or detriment to any terms, conditions, laws or regulations that are currently in force, and may be used to the extent of evidence, in a court of law.

Signed: John van Haefsen

Dated: 24th March 2010
To whom it may concern.

I have recently been made aware that Councillor Mrs Wyatt has been made the subject of an investigation into her conduct during Parish council meetings, and with this in mind would like to provide a small insight into the esteem that Mrs Wyatt is held within our community.

Over many years our parish council has struggled along, sometimes without a full complement of members, sometimes with a less than perfect direction from its chairman and always unfortunately with a disproportionately high level of apathy from the public. Despite all of these negative issues councillor Wyatt in her capacity as an Independent member, has in the opinion of everybody in the community, conducted herself with courage, dignity, dedication and above all a deep concern and love for the residents of Long Lawford.

Her relentless work in securing a better living environment for our village is nothing short of heroic, night after night regardless of the weather, and with the greatest respect, her mature years, she quietly and diligently goes about her business as a caring councillor with little or no reward from those who benefit most from her hours of hard work.

If Mrs Wyatt has a fault it is her inability to expect any less devotion and commitment from others than she herself commits to the work she undertakes. She has little tolerance for people lacking her drive and expects other councillors to behave with her unswerving devotion to getting the job done. Her long experience in local politics makes her an ideal member of the council.

I must admit when I heard she now finds herself in the position of having to defend herself before an investigation into her behaviour in council the very idea seemed to ridiculous to contemplate, here is a lady who has devoted many years of her personal time into bettering her village now apparently the victim of what can only be described as a witch hunt.

I was present at a Parish Council meeting in 2008 where the council were to discuss a Cemex scoping document. The Chairman Mr Draper conducted the meeting with an arrogant and condescending attitude that fell far short of his abilities as the leader of the council, he was rude to me, to other members of the public who were present and showed little respect for other members of the council. Despite this Mrs Wyatt behaved with the quiet dignity for which she is renowned.
The belief that Mrs Wyatt had compromised her impartiality by being a member of Rugby in Plume is frankly laughable would it not be for the seriousness of the allegations. I would expect that every councillor should be so concerned about the air pollution in our community that all of them were members as a matter of course. Why on earth would you offer your spare time to bettering the community if you refuse to show solidarity in the face of the environmental blight that threatens our family’s health?

In conclusion I can only reiterate my previous views on Councillor Mrs Wyatt’s long and dedicated service to our community. We live in a time of increasingly selfish and inwardly looking community mindedness where people of Mrs Wyatt’s selfless dedication are few and far between. Her many years of hard work should not be tarnished by a few peoples desperate attempts to remove her from the council just because they disagree with her single-minded approach to bringing a better quality of life for her community.

Thank you for allowing me to voice what I believe to be the feelings of the people she has done so much to help over the years.

G C Prewett (Mr)
6 Railway Street
Long Lawford
Rugby
CV23 9BA
CODE OF CONDUCT COMPLAINT AGAINST COUNCILLOR MRS P WYATT

NOTE OF FURTHER MEETING WITH MS D GROVES, CLERK TO LONG LAWFORD PARISH COUNCIL, ON 24/05/10

On 19th May 2010 I raised a number of issues with the Clerk arising from my meetings with Mrs Wyatt and which required clarification or comment by the Clerk. A further meeting was held with the Clerk on 24th May to receive her responses and comments. The issues raised and the Clerk’s responses and comments are itemised below.

1. There is the issue over the Register of Interests declarations of December 2008 and January 2009. Carol Bradford had given me a copy of the handwritten amendments to the Register of Interests dated 14th and 17th December. You had made a comment that they were identical. When we met you asked whether Carol Bradford had also given me a copy of a typed version of Mrs W’s declaration from January 2009. She had not, and at the time you weren’t able to put your hand on a copy to give me. I have since been given a copy of that document dated 20 January 2009 by Mrs Wyatt. The issues that arise are firstly that the 14th and 17th December 2008 documents are not identical. In the 17th December version Mrs W had included her membership of RBC’s Standards Committee as a representative of WLC. This she did on the advice of Mrs Bradford and she did it by inserting it between two other entries at the top of the last page of the document. (Easily missed.) The second issue is your advice to Mrs W at Council that the amended December versions were not acceptable and that you had been so advised by Carol Bradford. Mrs W challenged your advice because she claims she had also had advice from Mrs Bradford and that Mrs Bradford had accepted the December amendments. Mrs W subsequently submitted the typed declaration dated 20th January 2009. Can you comment on these issues? I have asked Carol Bradford if she recalls giving the advice to Mrs W and yourself but I am not confident that she will recall it after this length of time.

Response: Ms Groves said that Mrs Wyatt constantly questioned her integrity by asking for proof that she had done things or for sight of advice that she had received. She accepted that she had missed the additional entry on the interests form and the forms of 14th and 17th December were different. It was because of the number of additions that Mrs Bradford had advised that a new form should be completed.

2. With regard to the Parish Council meeting of 14th October 2008 when the Cemex planning application was first considered along with the Vice-Chairman’s notes, there is a fundamental disagreement over what was decided at that meeting. Mrs W says (corroborated by Mr Roper who was present as a member of the public) that the Council decided there and then on the night (because of the timescale in which to submit the Parish Council’s comments) to accept Cllr Davison’s suggested objections to the planning application. The approved minutes (and therefore the correct and legal position) state that, whilst agreeing with the Vice-Chairman’s
suggested objections, in effect the decision on the final terms of the Parish Council’s response
was deferred to enable other councillors to add comments to the Vice Chairman’s and for all
the comments to be brought to the next Council meeting in November for final approval. Mrs W
has no recollection of that part of the decision. She says she and the public present were jubilant
that the Parish Council had agreed with the objections. I would venture to surmise that they
were so jubilant that they were distracted and so missed the subsequent discussion to let other
members have a say and to bring back the final terms of the PC’s objection to the November
meeting. There is one question that I need to bottom, however, so that I can demonstrate that it
is not worthy of consideration. The Minutes of the last substantive item at that meeting show
that Mrs Wyatt and Mrs Watson left the meeting during consideration of that item (presumably,
shortly before the meeting closed). Can you categorically state that the Council did not re-visit
the issue of the objections to the Cemex application after Mrs Wyatt left the meeting but before
the close of the meeting.

Response: Ms Groves confirmed that there was no discussion of the Cemex planning application
after Mrs Wyatt left the meeting, not long before the end of the meeting. Re-opening an item
that had already been dealt with was never allowed. Ms Groves pointed out that at the time the
planning application was being considered, as minuted, she had made a point of mentioning the
timescale for submission of the Parish Council’s comments. Mrs Watson had reassured the
Council that the Planning Committee had deferred the meeting to which the Cemex application
would be submitted to December and so it would be possible to submit the Parish Council’s
comments as late as November.

3. Returning to the double white lines issue. Mrs Wyatt says that the County Council are now
looking favourably at the provision of the double white lines after she continued to pursue the
matter on her own. Were you aware of that?

Response: Ms Groves said that she was not aware of this but had no problem with it.

4. Regarding the one day or half day closure of the Post Office in Rugby, Mrs Wyatt says that she
was simply asking whether the Parish Council had been notified in advance of the planned
closure of the Post Office not that she was requiring the Clerk to find out why it had been closed.
Could you comment on that please.

Response: Ms Groves said that Mrs Wyatt did ask whether the Parish Council had been informed
of the intended closure, but when told that it had not been informed, she said she wanted the
Clerk to find out why there had been a closure.

5. With regard to the issue of the delivery of agenda and minutes and Mrs Wyatt asking for
additional copies, she has said that such requests were not intended as a criticism of the Clerk or
to question whether they had been despatched or delivered, but rather that she could not put
her hands on them and had mislaid them. She said it was more a criticism of her own filing
system. Comments?
Response: The Clerk said that Mrs Wyatt had never ever said that she had mislaid them or couldn’t put her hands on them. She had categorically stated that she had not received them on several occasions.

6. Mrs Wyatt clearly has not accepted the new ways of reporting financial matters – the monthly expenditure schedule and the quarterly reconciliation report. When these new arrangements were introduced, were they approved by the Council? She says they were just introduced by the Clerk. Was there either explicit or implicit support and approval from the Council for the changes? Also, she is critical of the Finance Committee, saying there are no agenda and no minutes. Is that so? Is it a properly constituted Committee of the Council, or is it simply an advisory panel?

Response: The Clerk advised that the Finance and Management Committee never made decisions but always brought matters back to full Council. It was an advisory panel. In 2008 minutes were kept. It was a very informal meeting where no decisions were taken. It simply went through the figures. Mrs Groves said she had spoken to Alison Hodge from WALC who confirmed that she was following correct procedures and that the procedures she had introduced were more than adequate and in fact were more thorough than the procedures in most other Parish Councils.

7. Can I refer you to your Documents 7a 7b and 7c. The last of these offers 3 dates in July 2007 for Mrs Wyatt to attend the Memorial Hall to inspect the Parish Council accounts. You made the point that you got no reply from her. Mrs Wyatt said she wasn’t aware of the dates being offered. After my interview with her she went back through her records and came up with the series of 3 emails which comprise your Documents 7a 7b and 7c. She says that she probably didn’t scroll down to the last e-mail which contained the dates offered for the inspection because she had already apologised for the Finance Committee meeting which was the subject of the first e-mail. Can you comment on this. Was 7c sent separately or was it sent as a reply to an earlier e-mail and so appeared at the end of the series of e-mails?

Response: The e-mail offering the alternative dates for Mrs Wyatt to inspect the accounts was sent in direct response to Mrs Wyatt’s e-mail in which she gave her apologies for the meeting but also went on to ask for arrangements to be made to inspect the accounts.

8. Regarding Mrs Wyatt’s membership of the Area Committee of WALC as a representative of the Parish Council, Mrs Wyatt said she was aware that Cllr Mrs Slack was appointed to represent the Parish Council at the 2009 Annual Parish Council meeting, but she said that after that the WALC officer told her that the Parish Council had 2 representatives and so they regarded Mrs Wyatt as still being one of the Parish Council’s reps. Were you aware of that? Did the WALC officer consult you or seek any clarification?

Response: Alison Hodge, the WALC Secretary, advised at first that the Parish Council had only one representative and so Councillor Slack was nominated. Alison Hodge subsequently came back, apologised, and said there could be two nominations. No further nomination was made by the Parish Council.
9. I know this next issue is outside of the period of the investigation, but Mrs Wyatt has raised it as an example of attempts to ostracise her. She said that at the March 2010 meeting some members had Parish Council Nomination for Election papers. Previously she says the Clerk used to provide these, but when she asked for a set she was told the documents had been provided directly from Rugby BC. She contacted Rugby BC for a set herself and on receiving them was told that 10 sets had already been supplied to the Clerk. You may wish to comment.

Response: Ms Groves said that the Nomination papers for the Parish elections were given to her by Rugby BC for people who expressed an interest and she gave the nomination papers out to those people who expressed an interest. Mrs Wyatt did not ask the Clerk for a set.

10. Finally, Mrs Wyatt has provided me with a copy of a letter from Cllr Mrs Watson – a former Parish Councillor. She is very critical of what she describes as the deplorable attitude and behaviour of the Chairman and the Clerk towards Mrs Wyatt at meetings of the Parish Council and commends Mrs Wyatt’s service as a Parish Councillor. Mrs Wyatt has provided other “testimonials” from a number of other parishioners, but this was the most significant. Again, you may wish to comment.

Response: Ms Groves said that she believed Councillor Watson had a grudge against her and she and Mrs Wyatt now had a common enemy, which was strange because they were never allies; in fact, shortly after Ms Groves was appointed as Clerk, Mrs Watson told her not to side with Mrs Wyatt or she would find herself very much on her own. Mrs Watson herself had even made a Code of Conduct complaint to the Standards Board against Mrs Wyatt in February 2006.

Mrs Watson was a former Chairman of the Parish Council and Acting Clerk. She as good as appointed Ms Groves as Clerk and at the beginning she was Ms Groves’ sole point of contact for advice and guidance. Gradually, as Ms Groves learnt from the SLCC manual and attended various training courses she began to realise that there were a lot of things wrong with the Parish Council’s administration which needed changing. The Parish Council had two employees - a Litter Picker and a Cleaner for the Pavilion, but there was no management and the two employees were not registered as employees with HMRC for Tax or National Insurance purposes. Ms Groves began changing things, gradually putting the Council on a proper footing. She put a stop to such practices as parish councillors themselves getting quotes for work etc. which was the Clerk’s job not a councillor’s. As these changes and improvements began to be introduced some Parish Councillors left, eg. Councillor Cleaver who had been used to getting quotes for Parish Council work and Councillor Muldoon, which was a pity because he was quite independent, but he was a friend of Councillor Cleaver.

Mrs Watson resigned as a Parish Councillor in November 2009. Ms Groves believed that she was getting angry with her for doing the job properly without asking her for advice and she didn’t like it. But the issue which prompted her resignation concerned the Section 106 fund of over £400,000 for off-site recreational facilities in the Parish. The Clerk was not aware of this fund but the Vice-Chairman kept on mentioning it. When she asked him about it, he said she should speak to Councillor Watson because she had a copy of the agreement. When the Clerk asked Mrs Watson about it she learnt that Mrs Watson was dealing with it on her own. But month after
month nothing had happened, yet in the agreement there were specific things that had to be done and specific items of equipment required and a lot of it was out of date. Moreover, it turned out that Lawford Heath, which was an area within the Parish, was not covered by the agreement. Eventually it was decided that what was needed was a public consultation exercise. Mrs Watson was still dealing with the matter. There was a Parish Fete and a leaflet drop and parishioners views were sought on what to provide. After that the Clerk received a rather sharp letter from the Section 106 Officer at Rugby BC because there had been no reference to her about what was planned. The Clerk rang the Section 106 Officer and explained the position. She sent the Clerk details of the procedures that had to be followed. She was concerned that changes to the agreement had to be approved and also that part of the Parish area, Lawford Heath was not covered. There was no apparent reason for this omission but generally, Mrs Watson and other councillors at the time were not interested in doing anything for the residents of Lawford Heath. There were purchasing procedures that had to be gone through – the Borough Council was tied in with a central purchasing organisation known as ESPO – and those procedures had to be followed. A meeting was arranged between the Clerk, Chairman of the Parish Council and Mrs Watson with the Section 106 Officer, a Finance Officer and the Play and Recreation Manager. It was established that for certain items, planning permission was required, but Mrs Watson had previously said that planning permission would not be required. The section 106 Officer was not happy that Mrs Watson was handling matters and advised that it should be the Clerk. Things came to a head when Mrs Watson had got quotes for certain items of equipment and ground works. She called a meeting of the Play and Leisure Panel to look at the quotes, which the Clerk and the Vice Chairman attended. Mrs Watson was pushing for agreement to a certain quote from a firm called Wickstead, which the Clerk challenged because she knew the surface being proposed for the equipment was incompatible with the suppliers recommendation. Mrs Watson did not like this and she stormed off saying that she intended to resign, which she duly did.

I told Ms Groves that Mrs Watson had commented in her testimonial that she thought it inappropriate for the Clerk to challenge Mrs Wyatt at meetings on her interests to be declared. Ms Groves said that these were not challenges as to whether Mrs Wyatt should be declaring an interest but requests for Mrs Wyatt to state the nature of her interest when declared and whether it was a personal interest or a personal and prejudicial interest. This was in accordance with her understanding of the Code of Conduct and she believed she was right to seek this information from a member for the record.
Notification by a Member of a Parish Council of Financial and Other Interests

I, Mrs Patricia Wyatt

a Member of Long Lawford Parish Council hereby register that I have the following financial interests (please state None where appropriate):

(1) My employment or business carried on by me:

None

(2) Name(s) of my employer(s) and / or name(s) of firm(s) in which I am a partner and the name(s) of Company/ies of which I am a remunerated director (delete whichever do not apply):

None

(3) Name(s) of person(s), other than a relevant authority, who has / have made any payment to me in respect of my election or any expenses incurred by me in carrying out my duties:

None

(4) Name(s) of any corporate body/ies having a place of business or land in the Council's area, and in which I have a beneficial interest in a class of securities of the body / those bodies that exceeds the nominal value of £25,000, or one hundredth of the total issued share capital of that / those bodies:

None
(5) Description of any contract for goods, services or works made between the Council and myself or a firm in which I am a partner, a company of which I am a remunerated director, or a body of the description specified in (4) above:

NONE

(6) The address or other description (sufficient to identify the location) of any land in which I have a beneficial interest and which is in the area of the Council:

"WYVERN" LIVINGSTONE AVENUE WEST
LONG LAWFORD, RUGBY, CV93 9BU

(7) The address or other description (sufficient to identify the location) of any land where the landlord is the Council and the tenant is a firm in which I am a partner, a company of which I am a remunerated director, or a body of the description specified in (d) above:

NONE

(8) The address or other description (sufficient to identify the location) of any land in the Council's area in which I have a licence (alone or jointly with others) to occupy for 28 days or longer:

NONE
I also register the following other interests:

(a) I am a member or hold a position of general control or management of the following body/ies to which I have been appointed or nominated by the Parish as its representative:
   - Rugby Branch Keeper K. Comm. Cement Forum
   - St. Andrews Church Rugby Welfare Charities
   - Foster's Bridge Trustee
   - Rugby Cement Community Forum and Sub Group
   - Rugby Tyre Burning Review Group
   - County Committee Member of the Warwickshire and West Midlands Association of Local Councils.

(b) I am a member or hold a position of general control or management of the following public authority/ies or body/ies exercising functions of a public nature:

   Ditto (as at (a)) which apply.
   - Warwickshire Older People's Forum.

(c) I am a member or hold a position of general control or management of the following company/ies, industrial and provident society/ies, charity/ies or body/ies directed to charitable purposes:
   - Livingstone Avenue House Holders Association (Secretary and Treasurer)
   - Long Lawford British Legion (Arbitrator)
   - Including any or all (as at a, b and c)

(d) I am a member or hold a position of general control or management of the following body/ies whose principal purposes include the influence of public opinion or policy:
   - Rugby in Plume
   - Sustainable Rugby Working Group
   - Sustainable Rugby Management Committee

(e) I am a member or hold a position of general control or management of the following trade union(s) or professional association(s): None

Date: 13th March 2007
Signed: P. Wyatt

NOTE: A member must within 28 days of becoming aware of any change to the interests specified above, provide written notification of that change to the Clerk of the Parish Council for recording and forwarding to the Monitoring Officer of Rugby Borough Council.
Parish Councilor. Lone Lawford

MRI. Patricia Wyer

Yours faithfully,

I trust my approach form is acceptable.

Thank you very much for your E-mail of the 17th at 10.21 and advice.

been lodged the M's. Debbie Goves - Clerk of Lone Lawford Parish Council.

Please find enclosed copy of my updated Declaration of Interests details which have

Dear Mrs. Bredford,

CV21 2LA

AUKBY

TOWN HALL

P/ Box 16.

My Carol Bredford - Head of Democratic and Legal Services.

17th December 2008

CV23 9BU

Ruby

LONE LAWFORD

Lingston Avenue West

"Wyverns"
Notification by a Member of a Parish Council of Financial and Other Interests

1. Mrs PATRICIA WYATT

a Member of LONG LAWFORD Parish Council hereby register that I have the following financial interests (please state None where appropriate):

(1) My employment or business carried on by me:

NONE

(2) Name(s) of my employer(s) and / or name(s) of firm(s) in which I am a partner and the name(s) of Company/ies of which I am a remunerated director (delete whichever do not apply):

NONE

(3) Name(s) of person(s), other than a relevant authority, who has / have made any payment to me in respect of my election or any expenses incurred by me in carrying out my duties:

NONE

(4) Name(s) of any corporate body/ies having a place of business or land in the Council’s area, and in which I have a beneficial interest in a class of securities of the body / those bodies that exceeds the nominal value of £25,000, or one hundredth of the total issued share capital of that / those bodies:

NONE
(5) Description of any contract for goods, services or works made between the Council and myself or a firm in which I am a partner, a company of which I am a remunerated director, or a body of the description specified in (4) above:

NONE

(6) The address or other description (sufficient to identify the location) of any land in which I have a beneficial interest and which is in the area of the Council:

"KWERN" LIVINGSTONE AVENUE WEST
LONG LAWFORD, RUGBY. CV83 9BU

(7) The address or other description (sufficient to identify the location) of any land where the landlord is the Council and the tenant is a firm in which I am a partner, a company of which I am a remunerated director, or a body of the description specified in (4) above:

NONE

(8) The address or other description (sufficient to identify the location) of any land in the Council's area in which I have a licence (alone or jointly with others) to occupy for 28 days or longer:

NONE
I also register the following other interests:

(a) I am a member or hold a position of general control or management of the following body/ies to which I have been appointed or nominated by the Parish as its representative:

- WALL - RUGBY BRANCH REPO ON R. COOM CEMENT FORUM
- ST. ANDREWS CHURCH RUGBY WELFARE CHARITIES
- WALS - RUGBY BRANCH REPO ON STANDARDS COMMITTEE RBC.
- FOSTER'S BRIDGE TRUSTEE
- RUGBY CEMENT COMMUNITY FORUM AND SUB GROUP
- RUGBY & RURAL RECHARGE REVIEW GROUP
- COUNTY COMMITTEE MEMBER OF THE WARRICKSHIRE AND WEST MIDLANDS ASSOCIATION OF LOCAL COUNCILS.

(b) I am a member or hold a position of general control on management of the following public authority/ies or body/ies exercising functions of a public nature:

DITTO (as at (a)) WHICH APPLY.

WARWICKSHIRE OLDER PEOPLES FORUM.

(c) I am a member or hold a position of general control or management of the following company/ies, industrial and provident society/ies, charity/ies or body/ies directed to charitable purposes:

- LIVINGSTONE AVENUE HOUSEHOLDERS ASSOCIATION (SECRETARY AND TREASURER)
- LONG LAWFORD BRITISH LEGION (ARBITRATOR)
- INCLUDING ANY OR ALL (AS AT a, b and d)

(d) I am a member or hold a position of general control or management of the following body/ies whose principal purposes include the influence of public opinion or policy:

- RUGBY IN PLAN
- SUSTAINABLE RUGBY WORKING GROUP
- SUSTAINABLE RUGBY MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

(e) I am a member or hold a position of general control or management of the following trade union(s) or professional association(s):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Trade Union/Professional Association</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14th December 2008</td>
<td>NONE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14th December 2008</td>
<td>NONE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Date: 13th March 2007
Signed: P. Wyatt

NOTE: - A member must within 28 days of becoming aware of any change to the interests specified above, provide written notification of that change to the Clerk of the Parish Council for recording and forwarding to the Monitoring Officer of Rugby Borough Council.
Dear Mr. Douglas,

I have just found the document of my Declaration of Interest form as stated was my latest version. The document is dated 20.01.2009 on my machine.

I mentioned this during our first meeting, when you had an earlier version supplied to you by Mrs. Bradford.

I trust you do not mind me sending this to you.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Patricia Wyatt

The message is ready to be sent with the following file or link attachments:
Dof Interests FormA.ParishCouncils.doc

Note: To protect against computer viruses, e-mail programs may prevent sending or receiving certain types of file attachments. Check your e-mail security settings to determine how attachments are handled.
Notification by a Member of a Parish Council of Personal Interests

I, MRS. PATRICIA WYATT

a Member of LONG LAWFORD Parish Council

hereby register that I have the following financial interests (please state None where appropriate):

(1) My employment or business carried on by me:

NONE

(2) Name(s) of any person(s) or body/ies who employs or has appointed me:

NONE

(3) Name(s) of any person(s) or body/ies, other than a relevant authority, who has / have made any payment to me in respect of my election or any expenses incurred by me in carrying out my duties:

NONE

(4) Name(s) of any person or body/ies who has a place of business or land in the Council's area, and in whom I have a beneficial interest in a class of securities of that person or that body that exceeds the nominal value of £25,000, or one hundredth of the total issued share capital whichever is the lower:

NONE
(5) Description of any contract for goods, services or works made between the Council and myself or a firm in which I am a partner, a company of which I am a remunerated director, or a person or body of the description specified in (4) above:

NONE

(6) The address or other description (sufficient to identify the location) of any land in which I have a beneficial interest and which is in the area of the Council:

"WYVERN", LIVINGSTONE AVENUE WEST,
LONG LAWFORD, R U G B Y, WARWICKSHIRE. C V 2 3 9 B U.

(7) The address or other description (sufficient to identify the location) of any land where the landlord is the Council and I am the tenant or the tenant is a firm in which I am a partner, a company of which I am a remunerated director, or a person or body of the description specified in (4) above:

NONE

(8) The address or other description (sufficient to identify the location) of any land in the Council's area for which I have a licence (alone or jointly with others) to occupy for 28 days or longer:

NONE

(9) The name, address and interests of any person(s) from whom I have received a gift and hospitality with an estimated value of at least £25:

NONE
I also register the following other interests:

(a) I am a member or in a position of general control or management of the following body/ies to which I have been appointed or nominated by the Council as its representative:

FOSTERD'S BRIDGE TRUSTEE.
ST. ANDREWS CHURCH RUGBY WELFARE CHARITIES.
RUGBY COMMUNITY CEMENT FORUM AND SUB GROUP
RUGBY TYRE BURNING REVIEW GROUP
COUNTY COMMITTEE MEMBER OF THE WARWICKSHIRE AND WEST MIDLANDS ASSOCIATION OF LOCAL COUNCILS
WALC – RUGBY BRANCH REPRESENTATIVE ON RUGBY COMMUNITY CEMENT FORUM.
RUGBY BRANCH REPRESENTATIVE ON R.B.C.STANDARDS COMMITTEE

(b) I am a member or in a position of general control on management of the following public body/ies exercising functions of a public nature:

D I T T O (as at (a)) WHICH APPLY
RUGBY COUNSEL OF OLDER RESIDENTS (TREASURER)(commence 01/04/09)
WARWICKSHIRE OLDER PEOPLES FORUM.

VALUEING AGE AND EXPERIENCE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

(c) I am a member or in a position of general control or management of the following body/ies directed to charitable purposes:

LIVINGSTONE AVENUE HOUSEHOLDERS ASSOCIATION - SECRETARY AND TREASURER.
LONG LAWFORD BRITISH LEGION (ARBITRATOR)
INCLUDING ANY OR ALL (as at a, b, and d)
SIR EDWARD BOUGHTON LONG LAWFORD CHARITY – RECIPIENT.

(d) I am a member or in a position of general control or management of the following body/ies one of whose principal purposes includes the influence of public opinion or policy (including any political party or trade union):

RUGBY IN PLUME
SUSTAINABLE RUGBY MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE
SUSTAINABLE RUGBY WORKING GROUP

Date: ........................................ Signed: .................................................................

NOTE: A Councillor must within 28 days of becoming aware of any change to the interests specified above, provide written notification of that change to the Council’s Monitoring Officer.
SCHEDULE 2

REFERENCES AND BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Model Code of Conduct for Parish Councils **


3. Standards for England Guidance re:
   - Bullying
   - Disclosing Confidential Information


** Available on standardsforengland.gov.uk