

## C1

The 'potentially defamatory' comment was made by Cllr Lovell at a meeting of WPC regarding a discussion of the new bus shelter to be erected outside the Angel Inn. He commented that the landlord had not attended an on-site meeting, asking "and what substance was he on?"

A second comment was made by Cllr Lovell in at the Douai 'Fun Day' about the death of the daughter of the Angel Inn's landlord. This had not been raised as an issue of contention until Cllr Renouf lodged this formal complaint.

When I represented the member of the public on this issue, I was not included in correspondence setting the time, date and location of the meeting and couldn't ensure the member of the public had received it, I was subsequently refused sight of this correspondence, and Cllr Renouf refused to contact the member of the public to explain why the meeting hadn't taken place or the reasons for the decision to take no further action on their concerns. This demonstrated a lack of collegiate behaviour and representativeness.

Mr Bull's finding that I brought WPC into disrepute by informing a member of the public of a decision relating to a matter that they had asked me to represent them on and the reasons this decision was made in a public forum, is beyond comprehension.

## C2

The issue of a potential complaint relating to the P2 meeting, at which the first of Cllr Lovell's comments was made, remains outstanding. The minutes did not record the decision reached to restrict reports from the public.

Cllr Renouf claims I stated I made a complaint. He raised this at the subsequent meeting without contacting me privately specifically in order that he could denounce me from the chair. I replied that he may have misheard, that I had contacted the Monitoring Officer but this was unhelpful, that I had spoken with the Clerk who had sought to convince me to drop the matter for the sake of harmonious relationships (the Clerk indicated he had communicated with Cllr Renouf on this), but because I felt public meetings are not private I felt this required further resolution on his part, and that I had found a notice of CAB dispute resolution service to provide mediation which I felt was an appropriate compromise.

It remains my position that the P2 meeting made a decision to restrict reporting from the public session, that this was both deliberate and incorrect, that this was not recorded, and that decisions later relied upon should be recorded. Cllr Wright relied upon the non-existent minute in complaint 4.

Mr Bull's finding on 'the balance of probabilities' that I had said this is perverse, as it contradicts the fact of the three steps I would take in the intervening period.

## C3

The issue of the 'silly letter' highlights Cllr Renouf's problematic behaviour. Cllr Renouf sent a letter to Chair of Midgham, Cllr Lombardo, who gave three reasons for rejecting the request and asked me to defend these, but because Cllr Renouf had not sent me a copy (although it was in my agreed area of councillor responsibility) and did not do so until 8 weeks after Cllr Lombardo I was not able. Cllr Lombardo asked me to return and get an explanation. I raised this at the next meeting of WPC, but

Cllr Renouf did not respond, except to the description that it was a 'silly letter'. He wrote a 1-line email to Cllr Lombardo asking if he had used the phrase, to which Cllr Lombardo replied asking in what context it was suggested this was made. Cllr Renouf did not reply. Cllr Renouf still hasn't addressed the 3 issues.

Mr Bull's finding is unjustifiable and incomplete, as he didn't read the letter and didn't question Cllr Lombardo as to the facts of the matter. Cllr Renouf still hasn't offered any answer to the three reasons his request was rejected, and the issues relating to sewage capacity in the village are ongoing as a result.

C4

The 'abandoned' footpath ('Safer Woolhampton Hill') relates back to C2, and reporting of issues of public interest. Cllr Renouf noted at a WPC meeting that he'd received a complaint 'from a member of the public' about a 1-line post on a private group noting plans to progress the project had been abandoned. I was at the meeting in question and it was a direct quote from Cllr Renouf that it had been 'abandoned'. I asked Cllr Renouf to provide details of the 'complaint' and whether this had been lodged with WBC Monitoring Officer. He stated he did not need to provide details. I asked for details on who had contacted him and how they had – whether in person, by phone, in writing etc. He failed to demonstrate any complaint had been made. Cllr Wright cited the non-existent minute from the P2 meeting, adding that he felt events at the public meeting were not a matter for public consumption and should not be reported, and I should close the FB group. I noted that the only person who was a member of the closed group and who had been in attendance at the meeting was Cllr Wright- and therefore was the only person who could have complained to Cllr Renouf. He is and was not a member of the public, there was no reason why Cllr Renouf should lie about his identity. I also note the principle 'if you cannot represent yourself, you cannot represent the public'. This was clearly improper and malicious behaviour.

Mr Bull's finding that I didn't behave collegiately is perverse, when the reverse is a more accurate description. He claims I damaged my relationship with other WPC members over this, but these were deliberately and actively undermined by Cllrs Renouf and Wright, if they ever existed in the first place (as Cllr Renouf has clearly stated in public he was opposed to me from before Aug 2014, and as Cllr Wright clearly stated in a private meeting that he 'would do everything he could to get rid of me'. The events at this private meeting which was designed 'to sort things out' are key, as Cllr Wright physically threatened me over a period of 90, then lied to me that he would confirm in writing to me the basis of our conciliation before lying to Cllr Renouf about what had been agreed. Mr Bull refused to take this background incident into account, although he claimed he was fully aware of it.

C5

The DPC mix-up was an inevitable consequence of Cllr Renouf's unwillingness to act collegiately (as highlighted above). He sought to prevent me from attending, then he sought to negate my interest in attending by pretending to be interested in attending it himself. He then bypassed the organising team at the last moment to express his apologies, which was unnecessary – this action showed he was more interested in boosting his status among dignitaries and in record than actually achieving any practical result. He also submitted a written question within my area of councillor responsibility

without communicating with myself. The question was redundant as it related to an issue which had been discussed previously at WPC. As noted in the email discussion with Mr Dunscombe, Cllr Renouf could have avoided any aggravation had he behaved with simple courtesy and followed basic procedures.

I agree with Mr Bull's finding that I expressed myself badly in email correspondence, but I feel the sentiment I expressed was reasonable considering the behaviour by Cllr Renouf to this point. Cllr Renouf caused the mix-up via his poor communication and has refused to acknowledge this.

C6

The 'votes of confidence' incident was a farce and a set-up. I stated to Mr Dunscombe that my concerns about Cllr Renouf's would be discussed at further length – they are!

The effect was designed to isolate me and avoid answering any questions about the improper, bullying behaviour and poor governance among WPC officers.

Mr Bull's finding that my answers to this matter were 'convoluted' is entirely reasonable, but exposes his inability to reach the heart of the investigation – Cllr Renouf has regularly stated his personal and political opposition to me, demonstrating his abuse of position is standard practise. This formal complaint is also a demonstration of this, as Cllr Renouf has detailed his wishes to exclude me in order that he does not have to account for his abusive behaviour, and that of others – he is 'victim-blaming' in an attempt to cover-up various process manipulations which have resulted in his failure to achieve results.

He referred to an agenda item 'Governance' which was included as a result of these emails, which I was expected to set out any issues I had with the way WPC was managed. I noted that I was allowed 6 words before this became a free-for-all when Cllr Renouf encouraged all other councillors to attack me personally. This follows a clear pattern of Cllr Renouf's abuse of public sessions from the Chair of the meeting.

C7

This incident highlights the widespread governance failure of WPC. Cllr Burke was coopted several months before I noted there was no public record that she had joined the council. She apparently felt bullied by myself that I felt this should be recorded in the proper way, as detailed by the Transparency Code. Further emailed replies from Cllr Renouf (as Chair) demanded that I 'resign' (which I feel is bullying) and from Cllr Wright (as Vice-Chair) that 'nobody cares about governance'.

Mr Bull's finding that Cllr Burke felt upset at being questioned is entirely reasonable, and it highlights both her lack of training and the lack of governance in WPC. That this became a matter of complaint rather than an example of a training need is ample demonstration of this.

C8

The 'crime wave' issue relates to the Parish Plan. When I raised the fact of a local crime spike in email, I included a link to the official Police crime stats website for any individual to be able to check. Cllr Renouf explained that he was unwilling to compare dates from different months because he was

unable to look at statistics from more than one month, but he could definitely confirm I was wrong. Cllr Renouf claimed that no NHW group existed in Woolhampton, and WPC voted to that effect – this directly contradicts the claim made by Cllrs Lovell and Renouf in their Parish Plan report that WPC had ‘completed’ the action item to develop the NHW network.

Cllr Wright accused me of hiding behind Data Protection rules for not providing names of NHW members. I explained that the Police refused to circulate names of NHW members to me in order to comply with Data Protection rules, and that I therefore did not have any names and would be prevented from sharing this information with him if I did have it anyway.

## General

It is my view that disputes of fact and law can only be resolved with reference to the relevant sources, and not according to the judgement of one’s peers, as Cllr Renouf would have it. It is this fundamental difference which made conflict inevitable.

WPC has taken a formal position of opposition to all and any training, including where legally required (including the clerk’s CILCA qualification, as mandated within the Transparency Code, which the Clerk has disputed is in force over a period of 3 years in order that he can excuse non-compliance with it, despite having been regularly provided with exact details of it – and which forms the substantial base of the issues under consideration here, ie that the Chair, Vice-Chair, Clerk and other councillors have actively sought to abuse their positions to avoid being held to account to the laws they purportedly uphold, and that this may indicate further wrong-doing on their part).

This creates a wide opportunity that responsibilities are not acknowledged, not understood and not followed, if not completely and wilfully disregarded or neglected. The ‘wilful neglect’ of their duties is the root of my claim that the four named councillors are guilty of ‘Misconduct in Public Office’, consequent from various other criminal breaches.

I first raised the issue of non-compliance with the Transparency Code in the month that it came into force, July 2015, noting that it required records are maintained online, but that WPC did not have a website, let alone one which was regularly updated. It is apparent that compliance is lacking in a variety of ways, and this supports a recommendation for a full audit.

Among further changes brought in under the Localism Act 2011, photography in public meeting is explicitly permitted, and is indeed encouraged.

Mr Bull criticises my lack of cooperation with other members of the council – I feel if I had been provided an induction at the start of my term, as required and requested, then this may have been possible. As it wasn’t, it is my opinion that Mr Bull has identified the correct problem, but the wrong perpetrator.