



## FORM A – 009/RVH

### Subject member's response to the evidence set out in the investigation report

Please enter the number of any paragraph in the investigation report where you disagree with the findings of fact, and give your reasons and your suggested alternative.

<b>Paragraph number from the investigation report</b>	<b>Reasons for disagreeing with the findings of fact provided in that paragraph</b>	<b>Suggestion as to how the paragraph should read</b>
7	It is fact that the individuals listed in this paragraph were interviewed, but I have asked Mr Lunn why he did not interview all the attendees at the 04 Jan parish meeting, as a basic matter of course. This is still not included in the report.	The paragraph is correct in itself, but should go on to read; <i>'The reason I chose not to interview meeting attendees Cllr Sylvia Lidgate, Cllr Pat Roberts, Cllr Carol Gibson and the clerk, Glenda Collins, is because...'</i>
8	I agree with the findings of fact in this paragraph, but the report should explain why the interviews were not tape-recorded, as it is recommended standard practice according to the Standards for England Board guidance document 'How To Conduct An Investigation'.	The paragraph is correct in itself, but should go on to read; <i>'The reason that I chose not to tape-record the interviews is because...'</i>

31	<p>It is not a finding of fact that I have a track record of identifying individuals to stand for the Conservative Party for local seats on all 3 tiers of the Council. There is only one comment in the entire witness evidence relating to identification of candidates; Ravi Gidar states that <i>'Bill identifies people and brings them in but we have our own minds and opinions'</i>.</p> <p>However Malcolm Bradford states <i>'I was asked by Phillip Dumbar (Dumville) to stand as a County Councillor. I told Bill I wasn't able to give the time commitment'</i>.</p> <p>Ruth Vigor-Hedderly states <i>'Malcolm called me and asked me if I was standing for the County Council position for the forthcoming elections in 2009. We discussed this between ourselves and agreed that I would go forward'</i>.</p> <p>Mr Lunn stated to me in my interview that <i>'I am right in thinking that you had a hand in choosing RVH as the candidate to stand in Iver Village and Richings Park'</i> to which I replied <i>'I played my part as a Branch Member. We lost the seat to AO and we therefore pushed to get a good candidate'</i>.</p> <p>Therefore this paragraph is not a finding of fact. It is derived from a single witness comment, whereas there are opposite comments from three relevant witnesses that clearly disprove this statement.</p>	The paragraph should be removed.
32	<p>This paragraph is not a finding of fact.</p> <p>I did not identify Malcolm Bradford to become a candidate. The BCCA agent, Phillip Dumville approached Malcolm and asked him to stand.</p>	The paragraph should be removed.

	<p>There is no witness evidence that states that I identified or forwarded Ruth as the candidate. It was a general consensus of the branch members that she was most suitable.</p> <p>Therefore the opposite is evidenced that I did not identify any candidates.</p>	
37	<p>This paragraph states that Ruth Vigor-Hedderly is adamant that she was made no promises of advancement by Bill Chapple.</p> <p>However in his witness statement, Bill Chapple states <i>'I always say to new Councillors that if things go right, you can work your way up the ladder. Nothing was promised.'</i></p> <p>Ruth may well have heard this comment from Bill Chapple as a promise of advancement if she supported his plans for LAF. It is interesting that Bill Chapple does not choose to say 'If you work hard, you can work your way up the ladder'.</p> <p>Bill Chapple then went on to state <i>'Bill Lidgate is the Chairman of the Rights of Way Committee. Peter Hardy is Chairman of the Regulatory and Audit Committee. I made these recommendations for Chairmanship.'</i> This further confirms the view that he is very influential over advancement at the County Council.</p> <p>In fact, Bill Chapple does promise advancement to individual County Councillors and this would be evidenced by myself, Peter Hardy and others. However we were not asked by the investigator about our view-point in relation to this.</p>	<p>The paragraph should also have shown investigation into the views of other County Councillors, to support or deny Bill Chapple's statement.</p>

40	<p>This paragraph is not a finding of fact.</p> <p>It is the complainant's view only. There was one witness that Ruth alluded to, by saying that she reported the incident to her mentor, Lin Hazell. Lin Hazell has been interviewed and does not mention the incident at all. I was asked about the incident and I refuted the account by Ruth as made-up.</p> <p>Therefore, for this to be a finding of fact the investigator should explain why he discounts my version and believes the account from Ruth. He should also explain why he believes Lin Hazell did not mention the incident at all, or why he chose not to ask her about it as Ruth specifically states that she told Lin about it at the time.</p>	<p>The paragraph should go on read;</p> <p><i>'However Bill Lidgate states that... Lin Hazell has not been interviewed about this subject because...'</i></p> <p><i>On the basis of all this evidence I still consider that Ruth Vigor-Hedderly's account is correct because...'</i></p>
41-42	<p>As in paragraph 40, these two paragraphs are not a finding of fact, it is one witnesses' point of view only.</p> <p>For this to be a finding of fact, the investigator should explain why he discounts my version and believes the account from Lin Hazell.</p>	<p>The paragraph should go on read;</p> <p><i>'However Bill Lidgate states that... On the basis of this evidence I consider that Lin Hazell's account is correct because...'</i></p>
43	<p>This paragraph is not a finding of fact.</p> <p>In relation to the sentence 'Councillor Lidgate does not recall either of the instances reported by Councillor Hazell' this is incorrect. Mr Lunn only asked me about one instance regarding a conversation outside County Hall with Lin Hazell. What he actually said to me was <i>'She says she was pinned up against the railings and told she must vote for Peter Hardy'</i>. I said that I didn't recall this incident but I did accept that at the time in question, I was trying to canvass votes for Peter Hardy as his agent.</p>	<p>The paragraph should surely include the serious allegation that I pinned Lin Hazell against some railings, and the investigator's findings on it.</p>

	I can find no witness evidence – from anyone – that states that I pinned Lin Hazell against some railings. I would like to know exactly who alleged this, and exactly where it appears in the evidence.	
44	<p>The paragraph begins by stating that there was a flurry of emails between Ruth and myself, most of which were copied inappropriately to a wide range of people, a practice particularly criticised by Damon Clark.</p> <p>I cannot find any evidence that mentions Damon’s view on the emails at all.</p>	<p>There does not appear to be any comment or criticism at all made by Damon Clark in relation to the copying of emails.</p> <p>If this is the case, then the sentence should be removed.</p>
45	<p>The two emails in question have been taken completely out of context, are not quoted in full, and do not show the true two-way argument that was occurring between Ruth and myself.</p> <p>For example, the email dated 19 Nov from BL&gt;RVH actually reads in full ‘Stephen tells me that you have asked for it to be formed and if that is right you could be on a similar path to the one that KW trod. She put her faith in BC and disappeared without trace. <u>I don’t want to be a Dutch Uncle but when we had lunch at The Swan you did ask me to help you if I thought you were being used and you certainly are in that category.</u>’</p> <p>The second part of that email would have clearly evidenced that my opinion was about whether or not Ruth was being used by Bill Chapple, rather than any threat of de-selection.</p> <p>The email from myself to Ruth dated 01 Dec 2009 is quoted in full, however it does not show any part of Ruth’s response to it such as; ‘I am not flying in the face of anyone. The members of the public put me</p>	<p>This paragraph should go on to read;</p> <p><i>‘However Bill Lidgate denies that he was threatening Ruth Vigor-Hedderly with de-selection and maintains that Ruth had asked him for his advice about her situation and he had simply told her his opinion that she could lose votes from the community if she progressed a LAF that local residents did not want, in a similar way that Kathie Webber lost confidence from the community and her peers by promoting policy that was not wanted by her constituents.</i></p> <p><i>Councillor Lidgate’s emails do show a courteous explanation for his advice to her, and, in particular, that it is the local</i></p>

*where I am today because I work very hard for them, I also worked hard to win my seats. I have an immense amount of respect for the members of the public and my comrades who selected me to stand within my areas...*

*For your information, regarding the LAF that you are trying to do your level best to destroy without good reason... Keep your nose out of my area, stop interfering in my LAF, you have made it quite clear that you want nothing to do with it. Leave Wexham alone. I do wish you would get the facts about LAFs... and be clear and sure in your total understanding of what a LAF is, you are clearly not. I have asked for LAFs to be revisited at the Parish Council meeting in January, if you wish to comment on this make sure you know what you are talking about.'*

This email can easily be interpreted as bullying tactics towards me, including a threat to keep my nose out of her LAF. It certainly does not support Ruth's stance as the sole intimidated victim.

Furthermore, I responded to that email by politely explaining what my views on LAF were. I also ended the email by clarifying exactly what I meant in relation to the emails in question and Kathie Webber.

*I explicitly said 'Ruth, you asked my advice, I gave it freely and judging by your response it wasn't the advice you wanted, so go to someone you feel you can have more faith in. PH or AB are highly intelligent, balanced and experienced individuals – give them a try. I think you are treading a dangerous path in ignoring local opinion and I told you as much the other day but you must do what you feel is right. Just don't shoot the messenger I have no wish to fall out over a difference of opinion.'*

*community rather than him that she needs to consider in her decision-making. He also encourages her to seek advice from other County colleagues if she does not believe his viewpoint.*

*Ruth Vigor-Hedderly's responses show that she is angry with his advice and that she would like Bill to stop interfering in her formation of a LAF. She also criticises Councillor Lidgate's ability to understand the concept of LAFs.*

*It is my belief from these two email exchanges, along with all the others, that the two Councillors were equally capable of fighting their corner and therefore they fall under the description of 'lively political debate'.*

	<p>The fact that I have cited local opinion as the potential cause of the problem, contradicts the allegation that I was using any personal power or influence over Ruth. My last sentence actually states ‘don’t shoot the messenger’. Again, it would not be anything I personally did that could affect Ruth’s position, it would be the voters and her fellow colleagues.</p> <p>This paragraph is not a finding of fact, it is entirely biased towards the complainant and does not use or reflect the full extent of the email exchanges. It does not allow for a counter-argument at all.</p>	
46	<p>This paragraph is not a finding of fact. The majority of the witnesses actually support the view that I do not have power or influence.</p> <p>Therefore, using a balance of probabilities, it should be concluded that I was not threatening her with anything.</p> <p>It is not ‘reasonable to read the two emails together’ at all. They are not two emails in isolation. There is a much wider and fuller email exchange that should be used to make the judgement on.</p>	<p>This paragraph should be removed, or should reflect the entire two-way email exchange that occurred.</p>
47	<p>This paragraph states that Ravi Gidar told Ruth that I had said <i>‘men in white coats would have to take her away and she would be seen as a woman with hormonal problems and that she had lost the plot.’</i></p> <p>This is not a finding of fact at all, it is the complainant’s words only. The investigator has not questioned Ravi Gidar himself over this alleged remark, and nor has he asked me about it.</p>	<p>The paragraph should be removed, or should have read;</p> <p><i>‘Ruth Vigor-Hedderly says that Ravi Gidar told her that Bill had described her to him as... Ravi Gidar confirmed/denied this when interviewed. Bill Lidgate</i></p>

		<p><i>confirmed/denied this when interviewed.</i></p> <p><i>As a result of all the evidence, I still believe Ruth Vigor-Hedderly's account to be accurate because...'</i></p>
48	<p>This paragraph states that Peter Hardy had offered to mediate and was sure that he could get Bill Lidgate to apologise, but that he didn't feel he could get Bill to change his behaviour and he felt that Ruth Vigor-Hedderly would have to sit up, put up and shut up.</p> <p>This is not a finding of fact at all.</p> <p>Firstly, it is not Peter Hardy who says that Ruth should 'sit up, put up and shut up'. Ruth clearly admits in her own witness statement that it is she who remarked back to Peter 'so I shall have to sit up, put up and shut up'. The investigator has chosen to suggest that Peter Hardy said this confrontational wording to Ruth.</p> <p>Secondly, this paragraph is purely based upon the complainant's account only and there has been no further investigation including with Peter Hardy himself over his discussions with Ruth.</p> <p>In fact, Peter Hardy's witness statement clearly says '<i>I had a series of conversations with RVH and BL to try and mediate myself. I invited them both to a meeting. BL agreed but RVH didn't agree. RVH in fact did not respond to my email.</i>'</p>	<p>The paragraph should be removed, or should have read;</p> <p><i>'Ruth Vigor-Hedderly states that Peter Hardy approached her to mediate and that she asked him whether he would be able to get Bill to change his behaviour towards her. She states that Peter Hardy felt that he could not.</i></p> <p><i>Peter Hardy confirmed/denied this when interviewed. He confirmed that he had asked both parties to mediate, and that whilst Bill Lidgate was agreeable to this Ruth Vigor-Hedderly did not agree. She also did not respond to his email offer of mediation at all.</i></p> <p><i>As a result of all the evidence, I still believe Ruth Vigor-Hedderly's account to be accurate because...'</i></p>



49	<p>This paragraph cannot be a finding of fact, because the investigator did not discuss either of these incidents with the very witnesses that were supposed to have said the remarks. It is speculation based on the complainant's account only which has not been substantiated by the individuals themselves.</p>	<p>This paragraph should be removed.</p>
55	<p>The paragraph is largely accurate, however I object to the emotive use of language in relation to the word 'dominate'. This suggests that others were unable to speak, and this is not substantiated anywhere in the witness evidence.</p>	<p>The paragraph should read identically, but remove the last three words of the sentence in question 'dominating the discussion'.</p>
59	<p>This paragraph is not a finding of fact.</p> <p>The paragraph describes my conduct at the meeting including stating that '<u>most</u> of the witnesses say that Bill interrupted or talked over Rebecca Carley...'</p> <p>Nearly a third of the meeting attendees have not been interviewed at all, including three Parish Councillors and the clerk who actually took the minutes of the meeting.</p> <p>However of the 10 witnesses interviewed, only 3 thought that I had talked over Rebecca Carley. 4 witnesses said that I did not talk over her. 1 witness said that I may have interrupted her during questions but that others did so too. 1 witness is unsure what happened.</p> <p>In relation to whether my behaviour towards the officers was acceptable, 6 witnesses state that it was, only 3 felt that it was not acceptable. 1 witness did not state a definitive response.</p> <p>Therefore it is a finding of fact that the <u>majority</u> of witnesses did not think</p>	<p>The paragraph should be removed.</p>

	I talked over Rebecca Carley, and the <u>majority</u> of witnesses felt that my behaviour towards the officers was acceptable.	
61	<p>This paragraph is not accurate at all, and is not a finding of fact. It is actually a view of the <u>minority</u> of witnesses interviewed.</p> <p>The paragraph should include a counter-argument as to other witnesses' views, such as Bill Lidgate, Mark Averill, Roger Reed, Claire Mowat, Julian Wilson, Derek Adlam. It should also indicate, again, that nearly a third of attendees were not interviewed at all.</p> <p>Even just using the attendees interviewed, the <u>majority</u> of witnesses thought that my behaviour towards the officers was acceptable, as illustrated in my paragraph suggestion in the next column.</p> <p>In this case, the balance of probabilities demonstrates that my behaviour was not unacceptable.</p>	<p>The paragraph should read;</p> <p><i>'Ruth Vigor-Hedderly and 2 Parish Councillors described Bill Lidgate's behaviour as unacceptable, and that the officers are right to feel aggrieved at their treatment. However Bill Lidgate, 3 Parish Councillors (including the Chairman of the meeting), 1 County Councillor, and the most senior County Council officer present, did not feel that Bill Lidgate's behaviour was unacceptable nor did they feel that he was not treating the officers with respect.'</i></p> <p>The last sentence that states that the officers were not treated with respect and BL denigrated the County Council's policy and approach should be removed.</p>
68	This paragraph is largely accurate, however the word 'undoubted' is an emotive use of language and it was not used in my interview when I provided my response to the investigator.	The word 'undoubted' should be removed.

69	<p>The second sentence of this paragraph says 'Several witnesses... cited examples of being intimidated by him or observing him being overpowering and/or rude' when in fact it is a <u>minority</u> of opinion across the whole witness evidence, and should therefore say 'a couple' or 'a few' rather than several.</p>	<p>The paragraph should read; <i>'A couple/a few of the witnesses...'</i></p>
70	<p>This paragraph is not a finding of fact, and actually contains untrue statements that can be evidenced within the witness statements.</p> <p>The paragraph states that I continued to deny the existence of such complaints despite Mr Lunn telling me that he had checked his understanding on this with Chris Furness.</p> <p>My witness statement clearly shows that I was led to believe by Mr Lunn that there had been 3-4 complaints <u>at SBDC</u> against me, and I replied that I could not validate that. I said I was only aware of one (SBDC) complaint, to which Mr Lunn replied that they were not serious complaints. Then he stated that in fact the Chief Executive had only confirmed one instance. Mr Lunn then did not give me a chance to answer that, as he then started talking about other incidents that had happened with Jeanette Watkins (a branch member) and Tony Connolly (Richings Park TA). We did not return to the subject of the SBDC complaint at all, so it is entirely inaccurate to say that I denied the existence of any complaints.</p>	<p>The first sentence of the paragraph is correct, but the remainder of the text is entirely incorrect and needs to be removed.</p>
71	<p>This paragraph is not accurate on two counts.</p> <p>It is not true that many people said that 'Bill is Bill'. The witness evidence shows clearly that the <u>only</u> person to offer this phrase was the complainant herself at the beginning of the process. However the</p>	<p>The first and the last sentence from this paragraph should be removed.</p> <p>It should be noted that the investigator was using leading questions to incite a</p>

	<p>investigator then uses the phrase to the remaining majority of witnesses, by telling them ‘Many people have said Bill is Bill...’ as a way of inciting an opinion about me. This is a very leading question, especially when coupled with the suggestion that most people have already said it. They had not.</p> <p>The last sentence states that my style is now seen by most as old-fashioned. I can only find 2 examples of this out of a total of 27 witness statements, and one is from the officer complainant, Rebecca Carley. Therefore 7% of the opinion should not be described by the investigator as ‘most’.</p>	<p>personal opinion about me, and therefore their responses to that particular question cannot be used as impartial evidence.</p>
74	<p>This paragraph is accurate in as much as it describes the accounts that Ruth and Bill Chapple gave, however it does not include reference to any counter-argument evidence.</p> <p>As already cited, Bill Chapple’s statement ‘<i>if things go right, you can work your way up the ladder</i>’ could easily be perceived as a promise of advancement if Ruth supports LAF. He did not say for example ‘if you work hard, you can work your way up the ladder’.</p> <p>In relation to whether the complaints are part of a wider ‘conspiracy theory’, it is useful to look at the emails leading up to the complaints submitted.</p> <p>The emails from Ruth to Bill Chapple clearly show that she was reporting many emails or discussions between us to him from at least 03 Dec 2009 onwards.</p> <p>On 05 Jan 2010 Ruth wrote to Bill Chapple and David Shakespeare to tell them about the meeting of the night before and to say that she would</p>	<p>The paragraph should include a counter-argument, including the evidence to support it.</p> <p>The investigator is then at liberty to make a decision upon <u>all</u> the evidence, not just the accounts of Ruth and Bill Chapple.</p> <p>The paragraph also needs to mention my request for all the relevant email-boxes to be searched, and explain why the investigator did not feel it was necessary.</p>

be 'guided by them as to what direction they wish her to go in'.

Ruth also acknowledges in her witness statement that, on the same day *'I called Rebecca to apologise for the meeting and she was very upset. I said that if she wanted to make a formal complaint then I would support her.'*

On 13 Jan 2010, Rebecca Carley sent me a letter outlining her concerns about my conduct and opinions at the meeting. She requested a response from me before considering making a complaint. But on the very same day, she also sent a letter to all the Parish Councillors to say that I had misrepresented County Council policy and provided a narrative against each of my remarks at the meeting.

On 14 Jan 2010, I emailed Dean Taylor regarding the opportunity to meet with Rebecca and discuss the issue. I was told that she had agreed to meet with me.

Then on 15 Jan 2010 Ruth sent a draft copy of her intended complaint to Bill Chapple, asking him for his comments.

The three complaints were then submitted as follows;

21 Jan 2010 – RVH

25 Jan 2010 – RC

26 Jan 2010 – SY

On 26 Jan 2010, I received an email from Anne Davies to say that Rebecca had now decided that a meeting would not be productive.

I would still like to know why the investigator did not feel it prudent to

	<p>examine the email boxes of all relevant parties in these three complaints to establish whether any collusion had taken place, and to obtain his own independent evidence of any and all emails relating to these complaints. It is standard IT practice in many other local authorities to do so in order to resolve complaints, staff grievances etc. It is in no way reserved for criminal investigations only, as Mr Lunn has suggested to me.</p> <p>The need to search computers is also discussed within the guidance document 'How To Conduct an Investigation' by the Standards for England Board.</p>	
77	<p>This paragraph is not a finding of fact.</p> <p>The second sentence states 'Dean said that Councillor Lidgate was reluctant to have other people present'. The email evidence between Dean and myself and Dean clearly shows that I was asking why Anne Davies needed to be present at a meeting with RC, I was not reluctant to have other people present.</p>	<p>The paragraph should include a sentence that states <i>'the email exchange between Dean Taylor and Bill Lidgate shows that Dean said a third party was essential for the meeting. Bill Lidgate replied by saying 'I don't mind, but it is still easier to arrange over the phone'.</i></p>
78	<p>This paragraph is based on the investigator's own viewpoint, so he should explain exactly what evidence he relied upon to come to this conclusion and why he discounted an alternative viewpoint.</p>	<p>The paragraph should go on to read;</p> <p><i>'The evidence I have used to form this conclusion comes from the following witness statements/emails...'</i></p>
81	<p>This paragraph cannot be a finding of fact at all.</p> <p>There is much less evidence to suggest that Ruth felt bullied or intimidated, and much more evidence to suggest that she is very capable of 'political banter' and of using intimidatory tactics to forward her own position.</p>	<p>The paragraph should be removed, or should substantiate exactly how the investigator has chosen to believe the complainant when the weight of evidence falls with the subject member.</p>

In Ruth's witness statement about the meeting, she says herself that '*I banged on the table and said 'let her finish'. Officers can't do that. I am not afraid of political banter.'*

As already cited (in Paragraph 45), Ruth responded to both my emails, using threats such as '*Keep your nose out of my area, stop interfering in my LAF. You have made it quite clear that you want nothing to do with it. Leave Wexham alone. I do wish you would be clear and sure in your total understanding of what a LAF is, clearly you are not. If you wish to comment (at the Parish meeting in Jan) make sure you know what you are talking about.'*

Nowhere in her witness statement does she make any reference to feeling bullied or intimidated. Whilst I understand that complainants do not have to use exact wording to describe the effect upon them, it is strange that the investigator did not ask her to describe herself how she felt about my behaviour towards her, but was only asking what she was hoping for in terms of an outcome.

In relation to the witness statements, 10 witnesses concur with the suggested (and leading question) viewpoint that I am capable of employing intimidatory tactics on purpose and could have done so towards Ruth, and/or towards the two officers during the meeting. The remaining 16 witnesses do not concur with this view, and their description of me includes wording such as assertive and passionate – but they refute the allegation that I am a bully or that I intentionally set out to intimidate anyone.

On the balance of probabilities, it would be reasonable to conclude that I

	<p>did not bully or intimidate anyone.</p>	
<p>82</p>	<p>This paragraph cannot be a finding of fact.</p> <p>As already explained for Paragraphs 31 and 32;</p> <p>It is not a finding of fact that I have a track record of identifying individuals to stand for the Conservative Party for local seats on all 3 tiers of the Council. There is only one comment in the entire witness evidence relating to identification of candidates; Ravi Gidar states that <i>'Bill identifies people and brings them in but we have our own minds and opinions'</i>.</p> <p>However Malcolm Bradford states <i>'I was asked by Phillip Dumbar (Dumville) to stand as a County Councillor. I told Bill I wasn't able to give the time commitment'</i>.</p> <p>Ruth Vigor-Hedderly states <i>'Malcolm called me and asked me if I was standing for the County Council position for the forthcoming elections in 2009. We discussed this between ourselves and agreed that I would go forward'</i>.</p> <p>Mr Lunn stated to me in my interview that <i>'I am right in thinking that you had a hand in choosing RVH as the candidate to stand in Iver Village and Richings Park'</i> to which I replied <i>'I played my part as a Branch Member. We lost the seat to AO and we therefore pushed to get a good candidate'</i>.</p>	<p>The paragraph should be removed, or should substantiate exactly how the investigator has chosen to believe the complainant when the weight of evidence falls with the subject member.</p>



I did not identify Malcolm Bradford to become a candidate. The BCCA agent, Phillip Dumville approached Malcolm and asked him to stand.

There is no witness evidence that states that I singularly identified or forwarded Ruth as the candidate. It was a general consensus of the branch members that she was most suitable.

As already explained for Paragraph 45;

The two emails in question have been taken completely out of context, are not quoted in full, and do not show the true two-way argument that was occurring between Ruth and myself.

For example, the email dated 19 Nov from BL>RVH actually reads in full *'Stephen tells me that you have asked for it to be formed and if that is right you could be on a similar path to the one that KW trod. She put her faith in BC and disappeared without trace. I don't want to be a Dutch Uncle but when we had lunch at The Swan you did ask me to help you if I thought you were being used and you certainly are in that category.*

The second part of that email would have clearly evidenced that my opinion was about whether or not Ruth was being used by Bill Chapple, rather than any threat of de-selection.

The email from myself to Ruth dated 01 Dec 2009 is quoted in full, however it does not show any part of Ruth's response to it such as; *'I am not flying in the face of anyone. The members of the public put me where I am today because I work very hard for them, I also worked hard*

*to win my seats. I have an immense amount of respect for the members of the public and my comrades who selected me to stand within my areas...*

*For your information, regarding the LAF that you are trying to do your level best to destroy without good reason... Keep your nose out of my area, stop interfering in my LAF, you have made it quite clear that you want nothing to do with it. Leave Wexham alone. I do wish you would get the facts about LAFs... and be clear and sure in your total understanding of what a LAF is, you are clearly not. I have asked for LAFs to be revisited at the Parish Council meeting in January, if you wish to comment on this make sure you know what you are talking about.'*

This email can easily be interpreted as bullying tactics towards me, including a threat to keep my nose out of her LAF. It certainly does not support Ruth's stance as the sole intimidated victim.

Furthermore, I responded to that email by politely explaining what my views on LAF were. I also ended the email by clarifying exactly what I meant in relation to the emails in question and Kathie Webber.

*I explicitly said 'Ruth, you asked my advice, I gave it freely and judging by your response it wasn't the advice you wanted, so go to someone you feel you can have more faith in. PH or AB are highly intelligent, balanced and experienced individuals – give them a try. I think you are treading a dangerous path in ignoring local opinion and I told you as much the other day but you must do what you feel is right. Just don't shoot the messenger I have no wish to fall out over a difference of opinion.'*

	<p>The fact that I have cited local opinion as the potential cause of the problem, contradicts the allegation that I was using any personal power or influence over Ruth. My last sentence actually states 'don't shoot the messenger'. Again, it would not be anything I personally did that could affect Ruth's position, it would be the voters and her fellow colleagues.</p> <p>This paragraph is not a finding of fact, it is entirely biased towards the complainant and does not use or reflect the full extent of the email exchanges. It does not allow for a counter-argument at all.</p>	
83	<p>This paragraph is not a finding of fact, but is based on the concluded presumption that Ruth has been bullied and therefore this is intensified due to the proximity of our locality.</p>	<p>This paragraph should read;</p> <p><i>'if Ruth Vigor-Hedderly is found to have been bullied by Bill Lidgate then it would be legitimate for her to feel more threatened and at risk of bullying...'</i></p>
84	<p>This paragraph is not a finding of fact.</p> <p>As already highlighted for Paragraph 59, it is a finding of fact that the <u>majority</u> of witnesses did not think I talked over Rebecca Carley, and the <u>majority</u> of witnesses felt that my behaviour towards the officers was acceptable.</p>	<p>The paragraph should be removed.</p>
85	<p>This paragraph is not a finding of fact.</p> <p>As already highlighted for Paragraph 59, it is a finding of fact that the <u>majority</u> of witnesses did not think I talked over Rebecca Carley, and the <u>majority</u> of witnesses felt that my behaviour towards the officers was acceptable.</p>	<p>This paragraph should be removed.</p>

86	<p>This paragraph is not a finding of fact. It does not examine whether the officers should have, at least, asked me to clarify or expand upon any of my statements that they felt were misleading. In particular, they were well within their Code of Conduct to ask me to expand upon or explain my comment about them ‘as part of the problem’ but they did not.</p>	<p>The paragraph should go on to read;  <i>‘Officers are within their Code of Conduct to be able to ask Members to expand upon or explain any comments, however in this instance they did not.’</i></p>
88	<p>This paragraph is entirely untrue and unfair. The investigator cannot speak on behalf of ‘the local community’ when in fact he has only interviewed three members of the public, all three witnesses having been supplied by Ruth.</p> <p>It is a finding of fact that my behaviour in a variety of local public settings has been cited by local residents and parish councillors, but <u>the majority</u> of witnesses spoken to feel that my behaviour is acceptable, so this should not be tagged onto a paragraph where the investigator is suggesting that I have a reputation as a bully.</p>	<p>The paragraph should be removed.</p>
89	<p>It is a finding of fact that Lin Hazell has described my behaviour towards her as threatening, however the paragraph does not allow for a counter-argument for <u>the majority</u> of witnesses that do not agree with her perception of me.</p> <p>I have already demonstrated that the SBDC Chief Executive only confirmed one incident of a former complaint against me in my 12 years as a District Councillor – an informal complaint that the investigator himself described to me as ‘not serious’, and which was resolved by way of a brief conversation between myself and the officer.</p>	<p>The paragraph should be removed.</p>

90	<p>This paragraph is not a finding of fact.</p> <p>It has already been evidenced that the investigator is relying solely on the complainants' own accounts. The 'mediators' themselves have not been asked by the investigator whether they felt that my apology would not be genuine or it would not change my behaviour in the future.</p>	The paragraph should be removed.
92	<p>This paragraph is not a finding of fact.</p> <p>The email evidence has not been evaluated in full; my side of the email exchange has been lifted out of context and without any mention of Ruth's very disrespectful responses to me.</p> <p>It is not clear exactly what 'conversations with others' the investigator is referring to, but <u>the majority</u> of witnesses interviewed did not feel that my behaviour was unacceptable or disrespectful to anyone.</p>	The paragraph should be removed.
93	<p>This cannot be a finding of fact.</p> <p>If the investigator had conducted a fair and thorough evaluation of all the evidence available to him, I do not believe he could arrive at this conclusion.</p>	The paragraph should be removed.
96	<p>This paragraph cannot be a finding of fact.</p> <p>The evidence clearly shows that <u>the majority</u> of witnesses believe my conduct to be acceptable, and that is without interviewing the remaining third of the meeting attendees who are quite likely to have further supported this belief.</p>	The paragraph should be removed.

97	<p>This paragraph cannot be a finding of fact.</p> <p>The evidence clearly shows that <u>the majority</u> of witnesses believe my conduct to be acceptable, and that is without interviewing the remaining third of the meeting attendees who are quite likely to have further supported this belief.</p>	The paragraph should be removed.
98	<p>This cannot be a finding of fact.</p> <p>If the investigator had conducted a fair and thorough evaluation of all the evidence available to him, I do not believe he could arrive at this conclusion.</p>	The paragraph should be removed.