

VEXTIOUS BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Thank you/councillors for your public support at the 11 June 18 meeting trying to resolve the outstanding vexatious situation, it was greatly appreciated. Following previous conversations with councillors asking for some background information please see the following as a fact gathering exercise for both sides to enable an informed discussion in the future.

From my perspective 'former' BPC vexatious statements and implementations have coincided with our requests for clarification of due process and/or access to public information; for example our previous requests for agenda & minutes, a copy of the adopted Parish Plan for a public inquiry, BPC's NDP process, and more recently issues surrounding the resident APM, with fundamental process questions still unanswered (e.g. see Jan 16 Common Ground meeting attached).

At the 11 June 18 meeting Cllr Hartree indicated to councillors that BPC policy and due process should be followed, especially with regards to the vexatious implementation against us. Therefore please can you find answers to the following questions, with reference to documented evidence supplied by Marian as Clerk where possible:

Some Vexatious Clarification Questions (Nolan Principles, BPC Policies & Processes):

1. At which documented full council meeting did councillors agree that the August 2017 implementation should be invoked against us, as indicated in Cllr Hartree's attached email? (We can find no supporting information)
2. The February 2018 vexatious implementation 'extends' the August one (see Feb 18 letter attached). We do not believe due process was followed for this implementation either, one example being why a year before the next review of the decision? (Min 304.22)
3. As far as we're aware Clerks have always been 'authorised' to acknowledge our correspondence, so why haven't they, it just drags issues over months and/or years, and necessitates repetitive emails from us? (not just a recent issue, see Feb 18 letter attached)
4. Why was the vexatious issue brought up again on BPC's last agenda before an acknowledgement or response (public or otherwise) was given to our/resident correspondence?
5. Why was the published agenda item worded in such a negative way against us? BPC could equally have written to the public '*Emails requesting an amicable meeting with BPC have been received again*'. (Min 310.21)

Some Recent APM Clarification Questions (Use of vexatious policy to not answer questions):

6. Which specific BPC policy was followed for the resident APM process and meeting? (We can find no supporting BPC information for May Min 308.4)
7. Which specific Act/law was used to convene and run the resident APM meeting? (e.g. only 6 or less days public notice given, not 7 or more)
8. Why were Cllr Blezard's comments re: the amended NDP resolution, that was voted on at the APM, not documented in either the resident APM or 04 May minutes? (His comments were in line with our/residents' concerns)
9. Why were the residents' contested 09 Apr APM minutes put on the BPC 14 May agenda for newly appointed councillors and Chair to approve? Why didn't Cllr Hartree, as former Chair, approve them at the 04 May meeting? (I believe they should only be approved at a resident not BPC meeting, e.g. next year's APM)
10. Where and when have BPC publicly minuted they will answer the outstanding [40+ questions](#) raised for the resident APM, over two months ago? (Many ground level NDP related questions remain publicly unanswered from the previous year)

There may be valid reasons for BPC's actions, which is why we/residents requested clarification.

FYI, BPC significantly rewrote the Vexatious Policy in July 2017 removing the "Right of Public Access" and other sections, despite councillors previously stating that it should remain in the policy. The differences can be seen by comparing the current version to the one in BPC's Corporate Policy 2014 on the council's website. We believe that the original version is more in line with government and national guidelines and should not have resulted in a vexatious situation between BPC and us.

At last week's meeting Cllr Hartree partially quoted Standing Orders to facilitate the vexatious implementation to stay in place until August/September. In light of the above, and the fact that BPC have not once spoken to us on this matter despite an 'informal' stage to the process and our requests to do so, I think the full Standing Order 7a, in conjunction with Standing Order 6a&b, may help expedite our opportunity to meet with each other in the near future, but please be aware of 9b.

I hope the above helps give you some understanding of the background from our perspective, and that you can gain clarification on the indicated issues from 'former' BPC for future discussions.

All the best, Jo