APPENDIX 3

FORM A

Member's Response to the Evidence set out in the Investigation Report

Paragraph Number from the Investigation Report	Reasons for disagreeing with the findings of fact provided in that paragraph	Suggestion as to how the paragraph should read
4.1	I note that oral evidence was taken from various planning officers, including from some who were not present at the meeting. I am concerned that oral evidence was not taken from either members of the public or from councillors.	
5.5	I note the comment that the outline planning permission set out the principle of the development of 11 houses on the site and now recognise that this was the case. However, at the time, Ms Gudger repeatedly stressed that the only issue which could be taken into account was access, as it was an application for access only. When myself, members of the public and members of the Planning Committee tried to talk about other matters, Ms Gudger repeatedly stressed that these other issues could not be considered and would be for discussion at the reserved matters stage.	
5.11	I accept that I commented that Ms Gudger should have been at the Appeal Hearing. The application was clearly of significant interest to the public and the Council were fully aware that the matter was controversial. This was particularly the case given that councillors and members of the public had been appalled at the reserved matters stage when they were told that the principle of the development of 11 properties had been agreed at the outline planning hearing. They felt very strongly that they had been misled, as shown in the written evidence which was produced.	

	At the Appeal, members of the public were criticising Ms Gudger. That is why I stated she should have been there to defend herself and the Council. With respect to the officer who presented the case for the Council; I believe that Ms Gudger and a solicitor should have represented the Council, as they could have presented the case more effectively.	
5.12	Please see my comments above regarding this. I stress that the entire Planning Committee, including the Chairman, were of the same opinion as myself. This was evidenced by the comments of many councillors, as presented to you.	
7.14	With respect, this paragraph appears to be jumping to a conclusion which I never said.	
7.15	I never intended my comments to call into question the integrity of Ms Gudger or her suitability to be a member of her profession.	
8.1 – 8.5	In conclusion, I again refute the allegation that my comments made an attack upon the integrity or professionalism of Ms Gudger or amounted to trating her with disrespect. Further, I did not intend to question such matters. I simply believed that it would have been advisable for the Council to be represented by her and a solicitor at the Appeal Hearing.	

FORM B

Other evidence relevant to the complaint

Please set out below, using the numbered paragraphs, any evidence you feel is relevant to the complaint made about you.

Paragraph number	Details of the evidence
1	EMAIL CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN CLLR I OGILVIE & I
2	EMAIL FROM CLLR MS D GARDNER
3	EMAIL FROM CLLR WATTS & HANSON
4	LETTER FROM CLLR STEPHEN

5	EMAIL FROM CLLR WEST
6	EMAIL FROM R DIGGLES
7	WITNESS MR R PRESTON 6 LILLA ~~FORD~~ PLYMOUTHAM
8	WITNESS MR IAN SCOTT 3 GILLER DR PLYMOUTHAM