

Appendix A

Schedule of evidence taken into account and appended to this report

A) Relating to both complaints

1. Email initiating complaints – Chris Elliott to Andrew Jones dated 7th December 2102
2. Statement of Chris Elliott dated 11 March 2013
3. Unsigned Statement of Councillor Linda Bromley
4. Email Peter Oliver to Heath Blenkinsop dated 3 July 2013
5. Email Peter Oliver to Heath Blenkinsop dated 8 August 2013

B) Relating to the St Nicholas Park complaint

6. Statement of Ian Coker dated 4 March 2013
7. Emails between Ian Coker and Councillor Linda Bromley on various dates between 29 June 2012 and 7 August 2012.
8. Emails between Chris Neville (ADT) and Councillor Linda Bromley dated 27 July 2012
9. Note from Ian Coker to Chris Elliott containing copy of the email from Chris Neville (ADT) detailing his conversations with Councillor Linda Bromley
10. Letter from Chris Elliott to Councillor Linda Bromley dated 29 August 2012

C) Relating to the Code of Conduct complaint

11. Statement of Graham Leach
12. Letter from Graham leach to various Councillors (including Councillor Mrs Bromley) dated 2 October 2012
13. Email and copy letter from Graham Leach to Councillor Mrs Bromley dated 9 November 2012.

Appendix B

List of unused materials

1. Various emails between Councillor Mrs Bromley and officers of WDC relating to the complaint prior to it being referred for investigation.
2. Various letters and emails relating to the conduct and progress of the investigation.

Andy

From: Chris Elliott
Sent: 07 December 2012 16:43
To: Andrew Jones
Cc: Graham Leach; Chris Elliott
Subject: A Complaint against a Member
Importance: High

Dear Andy,

I regret that I have to make a formal complaint against Cllr Mrs Linda Bromley. The complaint(s) centres around her disregard to the agreed office/member protocol in a specific case concerning a contractor and the allocation of funds to that contractor; and to her refusal to agree to sign the new agreed member/officer protocol.

The hard evidence that I given you sets out she clearly went around officers to talk to a contractor and from that contractor sought meetings and discussed with him that they may get more funding for additional CCTV works. I at first asked her to attend a meeting to discuss the matter and resolve it but she has effectively refused by not replying, despite two requests.

Separately but in parallel she has been asked to sign the new officer/member protocol and she has not done so despite again being given time to do so.

It is hard therefore for me to conclude that she is showing clear disregard for Council officers in clear contradiction to the agreed protocol.

Yours sincerely,

Chris Elliott
Chief Executive

①

LOCALISM ACT 2011 S. 28

WARWICK DISTRICT COUNCIL

Investigation into allegations concerning Councillor Linda Bromley

STATEMENT OF CHRISTOPHER ELLIOTT

1. My name is CHRISTOPHER ELLIOTT. I am employed by Warwick District Council as Chief Executive, a post I have held since 1st October 2006.
2. I have made two complaints to the Monitoring Officer that Councillor Mrs Bromley failed to comply with the Code of Conduct. These relate respectively to the way in which she involved herself inappropriately in a contract for the installation of CCTV in St Nicholas Park, and her failure to acknowledge receipt and understanding of the new Code of Conduct despite repeated requests and reminders to do so. I will deal with each of these in turn.

The CCTV contract issue

3. I first became aware of this matter when Ian Coker, the Head of Neighbourhood Services, sent me various emails, including one from Chris Neville, the Project Manager for ADT, and then raised the matter at a meeting of Corporate Management Team.
4. It was clear to me that a letter should be sent to Councillor Mrs Bromley outlining our concerns and inviting her to come in to discuss the matter. The question was who should send the letter. It would normally be appropriate that it should be sent by Ian Coker's line manager, Andy Jones. However, as he is also the Monitoring Officer, and as such must be seen to remain neutral, it was agreed that I should write it.
5. I was aware that an attempt to resolve the matter had been made by the Leader of the Conservative Group, Councillor Doody, who together with the relevant Portfolio Holder (Councillor Shilton), had invited Councillor Mrs Bromley to a meeting to discuss it. Councillor Doody told me that Councillor Mrs Bromley had refused to come to a private meeting, saying that if there was anything to be said, it could be said in a Group meeting.

6. I sent the letter to Councillor Mrs Bromley on 29th August. There was no response from Councillor Mrs Bromley, and it seemed that she was ignoring me.
7. I sent an email to Councillor Mrs Bromley on 28th September, saying that "you have recently stated to Ian Coker that he ought not to let the CCTV contract in St Nicholas Park without your say so". I cannot recall precisely when this incident occurred or when it was raised with me, but it must have been after 29th August, otherwise I would have referred to it in my letter of that date.
8. It seemed clear to me that Councillor Mrs Bromley was either ignoring or not understanding my earlier letter, and I therefore asked her to arrange a meeting with me as soon as possible. I received a short email response from Councillor Mrs Bromley denying that she had made the statement to Ian Coker. She did not arrange to come in and speak to me about the matter as I had requested.
9. I was satisfied that there was pretty firm evidence that Councillor Mrs Bromley had tried to involve herself in the contract in breach of the Code of Conduct and the Member – Officer Protocol. By this time I was also aware that she had failed to acknowledge receipt and understanding of the Code of Conduct (see below). I therefore decided that there was no point in my talking to her because it was apparent that she didn't accept Council policy. Therefore the only course of action was to make a formal complaint against her.
10. I decided that I should make the complaint for a number of reasons. There were by this time two matters raising similar issues of disregard of Council policy and disrespect to officers; a matter such as this comes as part of my role as Head of Paid Service; and I wanted to ensure that the complaint was seen to have some weight and when the complaint is from an officer I am the weightiest it can be.
11. The delay in making the complaint was not deliberate. I had intended that it should be made before Christmas, but I got caught up in the hubris of Christmas.
12. Since making the complaint, I have had no contact with Councillor Mrs Bromley about this matter.

The Code of Conduct issue

13. I became aware early in November that a small number of councillors, including Councillor Mrs Bromley, had failed to acknowledge receipt and understanding of the new Code of Conduct. Graham Leach showed me drafts of letters he proposed to send to those concerned following a meeting of the Standards Committee, when the committee had expressed its concern.
14. When the letter from Graham Leach failed to bring the requested acknowledgement from Councillor Mrs Bromley, it seemed to me that by failing to acknowledge the Code, she was saying that she didn't agree that this is how members should relate to officers. She was not prepared to talk to me or her Group Leader about matters of concern, or to accept council policy on relationships between members and officers. In those circumstances, I considered there was no other choice than to make the formal complaint.
15. I have not received any communication from Councillor Mrs Bromley on this matter since making the complaint. If she were at this late stage to give the requested acknowledgement together with an apology, the question for me in deciding whether or not to proceed with the complaint would be whether Councillor Mrs Bromley understood what she had signed and its importance. I would want assurance that she has understood the requirements of the Code.

Signed .. 

Dated 11.03.13

LOCALISM ACT 2011 S.28

WARWICK DISTRICT COUNCIL

Investigation into allegations concerning Councillor Linda Bromley

STATEMENT OF COUNCILLOR LINDA BROMLEY

1. My name is LINDA BROMLEY and I live at 11 Mercia Way, Emscote Gardens, Warwick, CV34 4QB.
2. I have been a member of Warwick District Council (WDC) since July 2010, representing Warwick South Ward. I have at various times been a member of the Planning Committee, the Housing Appeals Review Board, the Licensing Committee, Overview and Scrutiny Committee, Finance Scrutiny Committee, Warwick Town Centre Partnership and Warwick United Charities. I attend the Warwick Community Forum as a Councillor. I am also a member (although not in my role as Councillor) of the Friends of St Nicholas Park and the Emscote Gardens Residents Association.
3. When I was first elected to WDC, and following my re-election in May 2011, I signed a Declaration of Acceptance of Office which included an agreement to comply with the requirements of the Code of Conduct which was in force at that time.
4. I have received training in the old Code of Conduct, but I cannot remember when it was. I am familiar with the old Code as I have previously worked in another part of the country for a solicitor who investigates code of conduct complaints.
5. Between 2007 and 2011 I was also a member of Warwick Town Council (WTC).

The St Nicholas' Park allegation

6. I am a member of the Friends of St Nicholas' Park (the Friends) which is a voluntary community group set up in 2005. I have been a member of the Management Committee almost continuously since that time. At the first meeting of the Friends in 2005, everyone agreed that the issue of security in the Park was the top priority for the group.
7. In 2008, the Friends were consulted regarding a Lottery Bid made by WDC for funding for works to improve the Park. Although the bid failed, Chris Elliott offered £210,000 (which I think had been earmarked as match funding for the Lottery Bid) to be spent on improvements to the Park. I attended a meeting with Chris Elliott at which the Friends and WTC were present. We were asked to put forward suggestions as to what to spend the money on. I was involved in submitting this as a member of the Friends.
8. A public consultation was held in 2009, following which three priorities for improvements were chosen. These were the toilets, an upgrade of the river path, and CCTV and lighting. The toilets and the paths were soon sorted, and the money remaining was £98,000. There are emails saying that this money was ring-fenced for the CCTV and lighting.
9. The Friends were considered a stakeholder in regard to the Park by WDC, who set up a Park Improvement Group. However, progress with the CCTV and lighting was slow, and WTC asked for completion of this work in early 2011.

10. The Park Improvement Group prepared a plan for the cameras and made the first approach to ADT. We were concerned about whether Myton Fields would be included in the Park and were worried about the safety of schoolchildren. We had support from local schools for CCTV to cover these areas. There were several incidents involving groups of youths, who were also creating a nuisance for the residents of the old people's bungalows.
11. In 2012, I went to a meeting with Ian Coker about Severn Trent works in the area. He invited me to another meeting, which I think was to discuss the CCTV proposals, but I could not go as I was on holiday. He sent me a diagram of the proposals, which showed only two cameras covering the path to the Leisure Centre and the car park, but did not include Pickard Street, where several of the incidents involving groups of youths had taken place. The proposals did not use all of the £98,000, and I think the balance of the money was intended to be used to create a wild life corridor.
12. I replied to Ian Coker by email on 2nd July setting out my concern that the proposals did not cover the whole of the Park and that all the available £98,000 was not being spent.
13. On 27th July 2012 I rang the ADT switchboard and asked whether they had a technical person who could answer a question for me. I wanted to know if infra-red cameras and image intensifiers produced prosecutable images. Chris Neville rang me back later that day. I told him why I was calling. He said that he had a meeting with Graham Collis. I said that I knew Graham Collis because I am also a councillor. Chris asked whether I would like to join them. I replied that I wouldn't dream of imposing on their meeting, following which he offered to meet me after his meeting. I jumped at that, and he said he would give me a ring when he was free. I said it would be helpful if a friend from Neighbourhood Watch could also attend (I think this is the person he later referred to as a Park Ranger).
14. On the day of the meeting (31st July), I waited around all day, but Chris Neville did not call. I tried to ring him later in the day. I couldn't get through to him, and he didn't answer his phone. I considered that discourteous. I finally got hold of him next day through the ADT switchboard. He offered to meet me at another time, and I said that that would be good. I asked him if he had any literature on the effectiveness of cameras.
15. I have seen copies of Chris Neville's email of 2nd August to Ian Coker. There are many of the points in it which I do not agree with and do not accept as accurate:
 - 5th bullet – I only mentioned I was a councillor after he mentioned his meeting with Graham Collis. I was ringing as a member of the Friends who were liaising with WDC about the CCTV scheme. The Friends were anxious that the scheme should cover the whole of the Park, including Myton Fields (which was not covered by the proposed scheme).
 - 6th bullet – I didn't ask if the cameras were 'fit for purpose' – that's not a term I would use. I asked if the images were prosecutable.
 - 7th bullet – I referred to the £98,000 available. That figure was in the public domain, and had been referred to in the press and at the Community Forum. The Friends were committed to having that money spent on security, not on wildlife corridors or riverside planting.
 - 16th bullet – I asked if they had looked at the Myton side of the Park, which was my concern. I don't think he answered that question.
 - 17th bullet – There was going to be a piece in the local paper about the incidents in the Park and the paper had asked me for a quote as a Friends member. When the

article appeared, the paper had a headline alongside a photograph of me, so that it looked as if the headline applied to me. That was not the case, and I subsequently received a retraction from the Courier.

- 20th bullet – I am sorry about that – it is probably because he didn't ring me back. The Neighbourhood Watch rep and I had waited all afternoon for him to call.
- 21st bullet – I knew the cost of cameras because I had seen the quote – I don't know where he got £355 from.
- Last bullet – It was left for Chris Neville to arrange a meeting with me – how could I arrange a meeting with him as I didn't know when he would be available?

16. I never had a meeting with Councillors Doody and Shilton. I didn't know it was happening.

17. I received Chris Elliott's letter of 29th August. I thought the letter was quite clear and I didn't feel it necessary to explore any of those issues. The letter does not refer to a letter I sent to Ian Coker on 7th August about my contacts with Chris Neville. I thought that was an end to the matter. Chris Elliott admits his account is open to challenge, and states that it is not his purpose to launch an investigation, which he now has.

18. At the Executive Meeting in December 2012, it was agreed to install extra cameras in the Park (but not covering Myton Fields).

The acknowledgement of Code of Conduct allegation

19. I accept that I received various letters and emails from Graham Leach requesting that I acknowledge receipt and understanding of the new code of conduct, and that I did not reply to them.

20. I understood that the old code of conduct was statutory and governed by Standards for England. With the new code, the government's intention is that it should be voluntary. I have read a transcript of a parliamentary debate which contains legal advice about the new code.

21. The new code is the Council's code of conduct – it is not necessary for councillors to sign it, or to give written confirmation. Whilst I do not have any issues with the code itself, I do have issues with the arrangements for dealing with breaches of the code, which I brought up. These relate to rules of natural justice and knowledge of the complaint.

22. It seemed that we were being hassled by officers. Why should we have to take instructions from officers?

23. I believe there are at least three other councillors who have not given their acknowledgement of the code.

Signed:

Dated:



Peter Oliver <peteroliver@warwickshire.gov.uk>

Code of Conduct Investigation - Councillor Mrs Bormley

1 message

Peter Oliver <peteroliver@warwickshire.gov.uk>

3 July 2013 12:42

To: "heath.blenkinsop@btopenworld.com" <heath.blenkinsop@btopenworld.com>

Dear Mr Hathaway,

I refer to my email of 6th June to which I attached two draft statements for Councillor Mrs Bromley, and requested that you provide me with some further information as discussed when I interviewed Councillor Mrs Bromley. I have not received a reply from you. Unless I do so within the next seven days, I shall prepare a draft report on the basis of the evidence I have so far, including the draft statements which I have prepared for Councillor Mrs Bromley.

Clearly, I would prefer to have agreed statements and the opportunity to include the further evidence which your client has requested me to obtain. I therefore look forward to hearing from you in the near future.

Yours sincerely,
Peter Oliver
Senior Solicitor
Warwickshire County Council

(4)



Peter Oliver <peteroliver@warwickshire.gov.uk>

Code of Conduct complaints - Councillor Mrs Bromley

1 message

Peter Oliver <peteroliver@warwickshire.gov.uk>

8 August 2013 15:19

To: "heath.blenkinsop@btopenworld.com" <heath.blenkinsop@btopenworld.com>

Dear Mr Hathaway,

I note that I have not heard from you in response to my emails of 6th June and 3rd July relating to the draft statements which I prepared following my interview with your client at which you were present.

In the absence of any response, I have prepared my draft report on the basis of the draft statement. A copy of this draft report, which relates only to the two complaints made by Chris Elliott, is attached. Please note that this draft report is confidential and should not be disclosed to anyone other than your client, who should of course also treat it as confidential.

If you or your client wish to comment on the draft report or the findings, please let me have your comments in writing (email would be preferable from my point of view) by 4 p.m. on Friday 23rd August 2013. If I have not heard from you by that date, I shall proceed to issue my final report.

If you do make comments, I will consider them carefully, but it will be solely my decision whether or not to amend my report. If you require clarification of any points in this email or the draft report, please do not hesitate to contact me.

A copy of the draft report is also being sent to the complainant, Chris Elliott, who also has an opportunity to make comments.

I am still investigating the complaint made by Lydia Turpin against your client, and hope to be able to let you have a draft report on that matter in the near future.

Yours sincerely,
Peter Oliver
Senior Solicitor
Warwickshire County Council

 **Draft_report_Cllr_B (2).docx**
44K

5

LOCALISM ACT 2011 S. 28

WARWICK DISTRICT COUNCIL

Investigation into allegations concerning Councillor Linda Bromley

STATEMENT OF IAN COKER

1. My name is IAN COKER. I am employed as Head of Neighbourhood Services by Warwick District Council, a post I have held since 2007.
2. In late Autumn 2011, Councillor Mrs Bromley contacted me to ask whether I was aware of work going on in St. Nicholas Park in Warwick to turf over some of the flower beds. She is one of the Ward Councillors for the area which includes the park and was concerned that she had not been consulted. She was not happy and said that she was instructing the contractors (Glendale – the Council's grounds maintenance contractors) to stop work as the work had not been authorised by her or any other councillors. I investigated and rang her back to tell her that the work was part of the on-going maintenance contract. I subsequently sent her an email telling her that she was not authorised to give instructions to contractors, but that if she had a query it should be directed to the officer responsible. The Chief Executive, Deputy Chief Executive (Andy Jones) as my line manager and Councillor Shilton as Portfolio Holder for Neighbourhood Services were all made aware of the situation.
3. In 2011, the Council was proposing to install some CCTV cameras in St Nicholas Park. This was the third element of improvement work in the park. The Council had originally allocated £210,000 for all three elements of the improvements, and after completion of the first two elements, there was £98,000 remaining.
4. A piece of work had been done (based on advice from the Police) which identified the need for 2 CCTV cameras in the park. Officers were therefore responsible for delivering that scheme and spending what monies were necessary for that purpose. I arranged to meet the three ward councillors (Councillors Mrs Bromley, Guest and Mrs Mellor) at Riverside House on 8th June to explain the proposed scheme to them. Councillor Mrs Bromley was unable to attend, but I met the other two councillors and they agreed with what

was proposed. I sent an email on 8th June to various people, including the three ward councillors, confirming the outcome of the meeting which was for a two camera system and improvements to lighting. It was agreed that the scheme would be progressed as planned and the remaining money held so it could be spent on additional CCTV cameras if it was proven to be necessary after an trial of the effectiveness of the system. I received a reply from Councillor Mrs Bromley on 2nd July indicating that she was concerned that the CCTV would not cover the whole park and that the whole of the £98,000 was not being spent for that purpose (the work to install the two cameras and necessary additional lighting was estimated to cost £55,000).

5. At the end of July 2012, I received a telephone call from Graham Collis, who is the Council's CCTV Manager. He had received a call from Chris Neville, the Project Manager for ADT (who were the Council's CCTV contractors and who were at that time doing exploratory work for the installation of the CCTV in the park). It appeared that Councillor Mrs Bromley had contacted Mr Neville about the proposed scheme. She told him that there was £98,000 available to spend and that she wanted it all spent. She tried to arrange a meeting with him when he was in Warwick on 31st July, (to meet Graham Collis to discuss technical details) but the arrangements fell through and they did not meet. At my request, Mr Neville set out the details of his contact from Councillor Mrs Bromley in an email dated 2nd August 2012. I subsequently copied this email into a briefing note I prepared for the Chief Executive.
6. I was surprised that Councillor Mrs Bromley had approached ADT. She knew what the proposed scheme was, and any approaches she wanted to make about it should have been to officers and not to the contractor. It was clear from the email that the contractor was also concerned about the approach. Had she tried to meet the contractor with officers present, I would not have been too concerned, but it seemed clear that the arrangements she had been trying to make were to meet Mr Neville on his own after he had met Graham Collis. In this way she was seeking to undermine officers and was putting Mr Neville and ADT in an invidious position. Once I was aware of the position, I gave an instruction to Mr Neville that he should not get involved. I understand that Councillor Mrs Bromley again rang the contractor and demanded that he come to speak to her, but that Mr Neville refused.

7. On 2nd August, I sent an email to Councillors Shilton and Doody. Councillor Doody is the Leader of the Conservative Group (of which Councillor Mrs Bromley is a member). The purpose of the email was to bring them up to speed because I thought they needed to talk to Councillor Mrs Bromley to make it clear to her that in approaching a contractor in this way she was exceeding her authority as a councillor. I am aware that the two councillors subsequently arranged a meeting with Councillor Mrs Bromley for 9th August, but I was subsequently made aware that the meeting did not take place.
8. I prepared a note for the Chief Executive to brief him on the situation, and I am aware that he subsequently wrote to Councillor Mrs Bromley on 29th August. I saw a draft of that letter to check it for factual accuracy.
9. I have been shown a copy of an email which the Chief Executive sent to Councillor Mrs Bromley on 28th September 2012, in which he says "you have recently stated to Ian Coker that he ought not to let the CCTV contract in St Nicholas Park without your say so". I cannot recall having such a conversation with Councillor Mrs Bromley or of informing the Chief Executive of it. What Cllr Bromley had made clear to me was she wanted additional CCTV cameras included in the tender being let up to the value of £98,000 at that initial stage rather than had been agreed later if it was proven they were needed. The contract had effectively been let following my meeting in June with the two ward councillors. In any event, it was not my responsibility to let the contract. The contract was being let and managed on behalf of Neighbourhood Services by the Community Safety Department (of which Graham Collis is part).
10. I have not had any further contact with Councillor Mrs Bromley about this matter since that time.
11. I was advised that the Chief Executive would be pursuing this matter further with Councillor Mrs Bromley. That is why I did not make the formal complaint as the officer most directly involved, but I would have done had the Chief Executive not done so.

Signed .. 

Dated 4/3/2013

Peter Oliver

From: Ian Coker
Sent: 12 February 2013 15:33
To: Peter Oliver (peteroliver@warwickshire.gov.uk)
Subject: FW: Flower Beds

FYI

Regards Ian Coker
Head of Neighbourhood Services
Warwick District Council
P O Box 2177, Riverside House
Milverton Hill, Leamington Spa
CV32 5QG
Telephone 01926 456227
Mobile 07887684067
Fax 01926 456210

From: Linda Bromley
Sent: 29 June 2012 16:40
To: Ian Coker
Cc: David Shilton; Anne Mellor; Gerry Guest
Subject: Flower Beds

Dear Ian,

I was on holiday when you sent your email of 11th June and then went into hospital for eye surgery. As a result I still cannot see very well until I am able to have a new glasses prescription in about a month's time. However, I have struggled to read several emails, including yours, and have taken some considerable time to type this reply.

Following my conversation with yourself regarding the turfing of the flower beds (of which work you said you were unaware), I contacted Cllrs. Anne Mellor and Gerry Guest to inform them of the situation. Both Councillors were as concerned as I was that we were not consulted as Ward/Town Councillors/Leader of Warwick Town Council regarding these works and said that they would write to complain about the matter. Cllr. Guest said that he would copy in the Chief Executive. He said he was going to ask for work to stop meanwhile and I told him that I would go to see for myself what had been done and ask for the work to stop while the complaint was being investigated. All three Ward Councillors were keen to prevent any further unnecessary work continuing in case the decision was overturned and the flower beds would be reinstated.

I was, as you have assumed quite rightly, the Councillor who approached a Glendale contractor in St. Nicholas Park that day. I introduced myself and even showed my WDC security/identity badge. However, it appears that what was said has been rather misremembered. I told him that complaints had been lodged with the officers, including the Chief Executive, by the Ward Councillors as we had not been consulted about this work. I said that work should stop meanwhile because it may have to be 'undone' if the decision were to reinstate the flower beds. However, there was no question of the work being stopped because the contractor told me the beds had already been turfed over. He was very helpful and showed me exactly where they were and I took a photograph of one of them.

I then came back and sent my email to Jon Holmes with copies to yourself, Cllrs. Shilton, Mellor and Guest. Neither Ward Councillor has received the courtesy of an acknowledgement or response from Mr. Holmes. I was expecting a **prompt** response and we clearly would not have been in a position of any

claims being made about turf dying if this matter had been resolved straight away. I would not expect removing and re-turfing flower beds to be a normal part of the contract in any event. I was not aware that I needed authority to ask for the work to stop (albeit that it was too late for that) while the complaints were being addressed. Whose authority would I have needed?

I have since learned that while I was on holiday this matter was brought up at a Conservative Group meeting by Cllr. Guest and that Cllr. Shilton was going to report back on the matter. At the subsequent group meeting on Monday 25th June it was raised once again and I believe the matter has now been resolved. However, I am still not aware of the details of the outcome.

Linda

What's on - www.warwickdc.gov.uk/events

Latest news - www.warwickdc.gov.uk/news

This E-mail, and any attachments, may contain PROTECTED information and is intended solely for the individual to whom it is addressed. It may contain sensitive or protectively marked material and should be handled accordingly. If this E-mail has been misdirected, please notify the author immediately. If you are not the intended recipient you must not disclose, distribute, copy, print or rely on any of the information contained in it or attached, and all copies must be deleted immediately. Whilst we take reasonable steps to try to identify any software viruses, any attachments to this E-mail may nevertheless contain viruses which our anti-virus software has failed to identify. You should therefore carry out your own anti-virus checks before opening any documents. Warwick DC will not accept any liability for damage caused by computer viruses emanating from any attachment or other document supplied with this e-mail. Any opinions expressed in the E-mail are those of the individual and not necessarily those of Warwick District Council.

Peter Oliver

From: Ian Coker
Sent: 12 February 2013 15:34
To: Peter Oliver (peteroliver@warwickshire.gov.uk)
Subject: FW: agreement re introduction of CCTV and improved lighting at St Nicholas Park

FYI

Regards Ian Coker
Head of Neighbourhood Services
Warwick District Council
P O Box 2177, Riverside House
Milverton Hill, Leamington Spa
CV32 5QG
Telephone 01926 456227
Mobile 07887684067
Fax 01926 456210

From: Linda Bromley
Sent: 02 July 2012 10:31
To: Ian Coker; Graham Collis; Pete Cutts; David Anderson
Cc: davidshilton@warwickshire.gov.uk; Gerry Guest; Anne Mellor; Andrew Jones
Subject: RE: agreement re introduction of CCTV and improved lighting at St Nicholas Park

Dear Ian,

Just to correct your assumption that I was aware that the meeting on the 8th would adopt the scheme that had been proposed, this is not the case at all. I thought the points I made in my email to you of 3rd June would be taken on board, especially pertaining to the need for CCTV to cover the whole of the park (including Myton Fields). The major pedestrian and cycle traffic traversing the park has not been covered at all and it is essential that we make provision for this.

As you state, the funding is already identified for CCTV and Lighting and I am keen to see the whole of the £98,000 used for this purpose. If you are not intending to deliver more cameras to cover the whole of the park at this time, when are you going to utilise the funding for this purpose? Why is it still sitting in the coffers and not being used for the benefit of the users of the park, as they wished? The stand-alone wifi system could be implemented now without waiting for the Severn Trent works to complete.

You do not mention the input that the police had at this meeting and I should be grateful if you would advise of their comments.

I should be grateful if you could answer the points I made in my email of the 3rd.

Many thanks.

Linda Bromley

From: Ian Coker
Sent: 08 June 2012 12:58
To: Graham Collis; Pete Cutts; David Anderson
Cc: davidshilton@warwickshire.gov.uk; Gerry Guest; Anne Mellor; Linda Bromley; Andrew Jones
Subject: agreement re introduction of CCTV and improved lighting at St Nicholas Park

Just to confirm the outcome of the meeting I held with ward councillors for Warwick South regarding the proposal to introduce CCTV and improve lighting in St Nicholas Park.

The proposal for a wireless CCTV system housed at St Nicholas Park Leisure Centre with two cameras identified as camera blue and red on the plan was agreed. In addition the improvements to lighting and addition columns identified on the plan was also agreed. The costs associated with this work will be in the region of £55k which will leave around £40k still available.

As you know there is still the possibility that the Severn Trent works on Emscote Road will take place from August 2012. That should not stop us progressing the CCTV element of the scheme ASAP but the timing of the lighting works should be timed to link with the end of the Severn Trent works in the park so are dependent on when that work takes place. I will keep you informed on a date for ST works.

As the funding to cover the cost of this work is already identified can you ask you to take whatever action is necessary in order to deliver this scheme.

Whilst Cllr Bromley was on holiday and unable to attend the meeting I understand she was aware that today's meeting would adopt the scheme that had been proposed. Whilst I know Cllr Bromley is keen to see a larger CCTV introduced the delivery of the scheme we have now agreed does not prevent more CCTV cameras being added if a need was identified.

Regards Ian Coker
Head of Neighbourhood Services
Warwick District Council
P O Box 2177, Riverside House
Milverton Hill, Leamington Spa
CV32 5QG
Telephone 01926 456227
Mobile 07887684067
Fax 01926 456210

What's on - www.warwickdc.gov.uk/events

Latest news - www.warwickdc.gov.uk/news

This E-mail, and any attachments, may contain PROTECTED information and is intended solely for the individual to whom it is addressed. It may contain sensitive or protectively marked material and should be handled accordingly. If this E-mail has been misdirected, please notify the author immediately. If you are not the intended recipient you must not disclose, distribute, copy, print or rely on any of the information contained in it or attached, and all copies must be deleted immediately. Whilst we take reasonable steps to try to identify any software viruses, any attachments to this E-mail may nevertheless contain viruses which our anti-virus software has failed to identify. You should therefore carry out your own anti-virus checks before opening any documents. Warwick DC will not accept any liability for damage caused by computer viruses emanating from any attachment or other document supplied with this e-mail. Any opinions expressed in the E-mail are those of the individual and not necessarily those of Warwick District Council.

Peter Oliver

From: Ian Coker
Sent: 12 February 2013 15:34
To: Peter Oliver (peteroliver@warwickshire.gov.uk)
Subject: FW: ASB in Park

FYI

Regards Ian Coker
Head of Neighbourhood Services
Warwick District Council
P O Box 2177, Riverside House
Milverton Hill, Leamington Spa
CV32 5QG
Telephone 01926 456227
Mobile 07887684067
Fax 01926 456210

From: Linda Bromley
Sent: 25 July 2012 11:47
To: Ian Coker
Cc: david shilton; Anne Mellor; Gerry Guest; Julian Hill
Subject: ASB in Park

Dear Ian,

You said there was not enough evidence of problems in St. Nicholas Park. As I predicted, now that the weather has improved, the problems particularly for the people living in the sheltered accommodation at this end have escalated to intolerable proportions.

There are at least 50 youths gathering by Charter bridge and are smashing bottles, urinating everywhere, throwing red boxes into the river, jumping into the river, making horrendous noise until very late and the litter they leave is atrocious. An elderly gentleman was trying to pick up the broken glass this morning.

The elderly people down there have all their windows closed and curtains drawn and are terrified to venture outside the door.

Police have been called and attended but can do little to move them on. The problems are starting in early afternoon and extra officers are now being called in – as if they need this when they are on Olympic watch duties! There were three incidents last night and a fight was going on. Trent said the litter this morning was unbelievable.

If this isn't sufficient evidence for CCTV in this area, I don't know what is.

I have been asked to attend the coffee morning at the community centre next Thursday to discuss these issues. I am hoping that a WDC officer could attend and a PCSO if one is available.

Linda

PS Could you please let me have a response to my email of 3rd July. Many thanks.

What's on - www.warwickdc.gov.uk/events

Latest news - www.warwickdc.gov.uk/news

This E-mail, and any attachments, may contain PROTECTED information and is intended solely for the individual to whom it is addressed. It may contain sensitive or protectively marked material and should be handled accordingly. If this E-mail has been misdirected, please notify the author immediately. If you are not the intended recipient you must not disclose, distribute, copy, print or rely on any of the information contained in it or attached, and all copies must be deleted immediately. Whilst we take reasonable steps to try to identify any software viruses, any attachments to this E-mail may nevertheless contain viruses which our anti-virus software has failed to identify. You should therefore carry out your own anti-virus checks before opening any documents. Warwick DC will not accept any liability for damage caused by computer viruses emanating from any attachment or other document supplied with this e-mail. Any opinions expressed in the E-mail are those of the individual and not necessarily those of Warwick District Council.

Peter Oliver

From: Ian Coker
Sent: 12 February 2013 15:35
To: Peter Oliver (peteroliver@warwickshire.gov.uk)
Subject: FW: Response

FYI

Regards Ian Coker
Head of Neighbourhood Services
Warwick District Council
P O Box 2177, Riverside House
Milverton Hill, Leamington Spa
CV32 5QG
Telephone 01926 456227
Mobile 07887684067
Fax 01926 456210

From: Linda Bromley
Sent: 07 August 2012 17:20
To: Ian Coker
Cc: David Shilton; Anne Mellor; Gerry Guest; Andrew Jones
Subject: RE: Response

Dear Mr. Coker,

I rang ADT to ask a simple technical question, which was, can a fixed camera give prosecutable images in the dark, with the addition of image intensifiers/infra red if necessary. This was because I am aware that the lights are going out at 12 midnight soon. This was not related to the scheme that is being installed. They put me on to the consultant who was the one who said he was going to the park and would we like to meet up? The suggestion came from him. It was not at my request.

Linda

From: Ian Coker
Sent: 06 August 2012 15:55
To: Linda Bromley
Cc: David Shilton; Anne Mellor; Gerry Guest; Andrew Jones
Subject: RE: Response

Cllr Bromley

We are in ongoing discussions with WCC regarding the cost of improvements to lighting in the park needed to make the CCTV effective. This could increase the costs which I have reflected in the £65k.

I am still hopeful that the original figure I quoted (£56.5k) will be achieved for the two cameras and lighting.

Whatever funding that remains it won't be offered up until we have assessed the impact of the scheme being delivered and if more of the funding is required to deliver the scheme. Even then I suspect the funds will be spent on St Nicholas Park projects rather than taken as a saving.

I was interested to see an article in last weeks Courier which you were quoted covering the issue. I also understand you have been in contact with our supplier ADT asking for information from them and requesting a site meeting

with their project manager. If there are matters relating to the scheme we are delivering that you have then those queries should be directed to the officers delivering the scheme not to our contractor.

Regards Ian Coker
Head of Neighbourhood Services
Warwick District Council
P O Box 2177, Riverside House
Milverton Hill, Leamington Spa
CV32 5QG
Telephone 01926 456227
Mobile 07887684067
Fax 01926 456210

From: Linda Bromley
Sent: 02 August 2012 15:37
To: Ian Coker
Cc: David Shilton; Anne Mellor; Gerry Guest; Andrew Jones
Subject: RE: Response

Dear Mr. Coker,

The reason I questioned this is that the costs have increased by £10,000 from what was stated in your email of 1st June. The CCTV element was in the region of £46.5K and the lighting costs were £9K. How has it increased by so much please?

Linda

From: Ian Coker
Sent: 01 August 2012 12:26
To: Linda Bromley
Cc: David Shilton; Anne Mellor; Gerry Guest; Andrew Jones
Subject: RE: Response

Cllr Bromley

The costs associated with the scheme have been discussed at previous meetings.

Very simply the £65k includes the cost of improvements to lighting (£10k) in the area where the additional CCTV is located so it is effective.

Regards Ian Coker
Head of Neighbourhood Services
Warwick District Council
P O Box 2177, Riverside House
Milverton Hill, Leamington Spa
CV32 5QG
Telephone 01926 456227
Mobile 07887684067
Fax 01926 456210

From: Linda Bromley
Sent: 31 July 2012 17:59
To: Ian Coker
Cc: David Shilton; Anne Mellor; Gerry Guest; Andrew Jones
Subject: RE: Response

Dear Mr. Coker,

I'm glad you are prepared to keep the rest of the monies available as it was ringfenced. I understood that the scheme you have decided upon is costing £55,000. Why has it now risen to £65,000?

The point about the cameras in the Leisure Centre is that they are fixed in positions overlooking trouble spots, i.e. the path leading to the car park, the all-weather pitch and more particularly the skateboard park where the police have problems regularly. Monitored cameras are obviously far superior but there have been prosecutions from fixed cameras, - the one at the Scout Hut for one, and so they are doing a service to security, albeit having to be downloaded by the police. This is far better than having nothing in the trouble spots in my opinion. The other factor in their favour is that they can be upgraded very cheaply – hundreds of pounds not thousands.

I know that the Boathouse has experienced appalling vandalism and theft which is why he has razor wire on the premises – against the advice of the police. A fixed camera here would be invaluable.

The recent problems will recur as they always do so we really need the one at the Scout Hut upgraded as it is only video recordings, not DVD.

I should appreciate your comments please.

Linda

From: Ian Coker
Sent: 31 July 2012 10:47
To: Linda Bromley
Cc: David Shilton; Anne Mellor; Gerry Guest; Andrew Jones
Subject: RE: Response

Cllr Bromley

Service area manager are looking to make financial savings wherever possible to help meet the councils medium term financial strategy so I am surprised you say you don't believe WDC is that strapped for cash. My service area has to make savings of £135k this year alone.

I have clarified the position over the funding with my portfolio holder and deputy chief executive.

Just because there is £98,000 left after having delivered the other two projects we don't automatically have to spend the £98k on the final project. We have put together a scheme which is expected to cost £65k which leaves £33k left.

In the current financial position I would normally expect to have to offer up that as a saving but given the funds are ring fenced for St Nicholas Park I suspect we can argue the money can still be spent there. If the money is not required for additional CCTV and does not need to be offered up as a saving then there were plenty of other projects identified at St Nicholas Park which the money could help deliver.

What I thought I had made clear was that money won't be immediately offered up as a saving so if after we have evaluated the impact of the two Wi-Fi CCTV cameras we consider more cameras need to be added we can do so. I am therefore confused as to why you feel this is an issue.

As far as the CCTV at the leisure centre is concerned the cameras which cover the outside of the building are fixed and as a result only monitor a very small area. Fully functional cameras are far more effective but require the input from an operator who can monitor the images and move the camera in order to follow or identify incidents or people. If functional cameras are fixed to a building their functionality is restricted whereas new wi-fi cameras on poles can be located to cover the maximum area possible. We are therefore better using the funds to provide new fully functional wi-fi cameras in the park rather than upgrade the current fixed cameras at leisure centre which are recorded but not monitored in the way the new wi-fi cameras will be.

I don't think there is any more I can add at this time other than focus on working with colleagues to get this project delivered.

Regards Ian Coker
Head of Neighbourhood Services
Warwick District Council
P O Box 2177, Riverside House
Milverton Hill, Leamington Spa
CV32 5QG
Telephone 01926 456227
Mobile 07887684067
Fax 01926 456210

From: Linda Bromley
Sent: 30 July 2012 16:44
To: Ian Coker
Cc: David Shilton; Anne Mellor; Gerry Guest
Subject: RE: Response

Dear Mr. Coker,

The three priorities were the subject of a response from the public and I'm sure the public did not agree to some of these monies being diverted from the priorities chosen. At the parks improvement meetings this fact was never mentioned and I do not understand why this promised money is not being spent on the original project. As far as I know councillors have not been asked to "save" some of this money and I should like to know who has made this decision please. We are not that "strapped for cash".

One of the questions I asked was about the four cameras on the leisure centre (where there are problems) and other cameras being upgraded and brought back into operation. One is the Scout Hut camera. This would cost very little and I should like to know why these are not being tackled.

Could you also respond to the other comments I made please.

Many thanks.

Linda

From: Ian Coker
Sent: 30 July 2012 13:24
To: Linda Bromley
Cc: David Shilton; Anne Mellor; Gerry Guest
Subject: RE: Response

Cllr Bromley

Having checked my e-mails I can confirm that the e-mail sent out at 12.11 on 3rd July in relation to CCTV meeting held on 8th June also made reference to the issues you had raised in your e-mail of 3rd June. I have tried to clarify the main points below.

The report to the Executive earmarked £210k to fund three elements of works in St Nicholas Park. The first two phases, additional public convenience provision and improvements to paths along the river have been completed. Whilst there is £98k remaining that requires no further Executive approval it does not necessarily mean that all that amount has to be spent on CCTV and lighting.

Given the financial position the Council finds itself in any potential saving that might come from the procurement of equipment for an appropriate CCTV / lighting scheme would normally be expected to be given up. As the funding was ring fenced for St Nicholas Park any savings there might be following delivering of CCTV / lighting could be used to fund other items on the list of improvements which were identified along with the Friends of St Nicholas Park.

The question is therefore what is the most appropriate CCTV / lighting scheme to deliver?

We have already placed an order for a 2 CCTV camera system and improved lighting which is estimated to cost £65,000 which has local councillor approval. Given what is being introduced is a Wi-Fi camera system we can easily add additional CCTV cameras if there is evidence they are required.

Given recent concerns that have been raised about anti social behaviour we think it would be prudent to hold the remaining funding back in order to monitor the impact that the new camera system is having on ASB. We will then be in a much better position to determine how the remaining funding is best spent.

Regards Ian Coker
Head of Neighbourhood Services
Warwick District Council
P O Box 2177, Riverside House
Milverton Hill, Leamington Spa
CV32 5QG
Telephone 01926 456227
Mobile 07887684067
Fax 01926 456210

From: Linda Bromley
Sent: 26 July 2012 11:43
To: Ian Coker
Cc: David Shilton; Anne Mellor; Gerry Guest
Subject: Response

Dear Mr. Coker,

I'm sorry, I typed July instead of June. It was my email of 3rd June which I was requesting your comments on please.

Linda

What's on - www.warwickdc.gov.uk/events

Latest news - www.warwickdc.gov.uk/news

This E-mail, and any attachments, may contain PROTECTED information and is intended solely for the individual to whom it is addressed. It may contain sensitive or protectively marked material and should be handled accordingly. If this E-mail has been misdirected, please notify the author immediately. If you are not the intended recipient you must not disclose, distribute, copy, print or rely on any of the information contained in it or attached, and all copies must be deleted immediately. Whilst we take reasonable steps to try to identify any software viruses, any attachments to this E-mail may nevertheless contain viruses which our anti-virus software has failed to identify. You should therefore carry out your own anti-virus checks before opening any documents. Warwick DC will not accept any liability for damage caused by computer viruses emanating from any attachment or other document supplied with this e-mail. Any opinions expressed in the E-mail are those of the individual and not necessarily those of Warwick District Council.

Andrew Jones

From: Linda Bromley
Sent: 27 July 2012 13:57
To: Neville, Chris [ADT UK - Birmingham]
Subject: RE:

Hi Neville,

Thanks so much for this. I'll keep my mobile on and wait to hear from you. [REDACTED]

Linda

From: Neville, Chris [ADT UK - Birmingham] [REDACTED]
Sent: 27 July 2012 13:17
To: Linda Bromley
Subject:

Hi Linda,

Bellow is my details, I would suggest around 12 if that's any good? If you take my mobile number/send me yours, I can advise you when I am free.

Regards

Chris Neville
Senior Technical Consultant
Commercial & Systems Sales - Birmingham, IOM

ADT Fire and Security plc
ADT House, Mucklow Office Park, Mucklow Hill, Halesowen
Birmingham
West Midlands
B62 8DA

tel: [REDACTED]
Fax: [REDACTED]
Cell: [REDACTED]

www.adt.co.uk



A Tyco International Company

This e-mail contains privileged and confidential information intended for the use of the addressees named above. If you are not the intended recipient of this e-mail, you are hereby notified that you must not disseminate, copy or take any action in respect of any information contained in it. If you have received this e-mail in error, please notify the sender immediately by e-mail and immediately destroy this e-mail and its attachments.

What's on - www.warwickdc.gov.uk/events

Latest news - www.warwickdc.gov.uk/news

This E-mail, and any attachments, may contain PROTECTED information and is intended solely for the individual to whom it is addressed. It may contain sensitive or protectively marked material and should be handled accordingly. If this E-mail has been misdirected, please notify the author immediately. If you are not the intended recipient you must not disclose, distribute, copy, print or rely on any of the information contained in it or attached, and all copies must be deleted immediately. Whilst we take reasonable steps to try to identify any software viruses, any attachments to this E-mail may nevertheless contain viruses which our anti-virus software has failed to identify. You should therefore carry out your own anti-virus checks before opening any documents. Warwick DC will not accept any liability for damage caused by computer viruses emanating from any attachment or other document supplied with this e-mail. Any opinions expressed in the E-mail are those of the individual and not necessarily those of Warwick District Council.

Chris Elliott

Possible breach of councillor protocol / code of conduct

I have been given information from Chris Neville who is the project manager for ADT one of our contractors who are providing CCTV in St Nicholas Park. The information relates to the actions of a councillor who has been in contact with him regarding some scheme ADT are delivering.

As you will be aware we are planning to install a CCTV system at St Nicholas Park. This is the final element to improvements at St Nicholas Park which had £210,000 allocated in 2009. The first two elements have been delivered at a cost of £112,000 leaving £98,000 available to deliver the final element.

On the basis of the information officers had been given by the Police relating to the level of crime and ASB which had been taking place in St Nicholas Park over several years officers drew up what they considered to be a suitable scheme.

Early last month I met with two ward councillors for Warwick South and agreed that that two camera Wi-Fi CCTV scheme together with improvements to lighting would be introduced at St Nicholas Park at a cost of £55,000. Cllr Bromley was not able to attend the meeting but I confirmed to all three councillors the scheme that had been agreed and the cost.

Since that date I have received e-mails from Cllr Bromley stating that she could do not understand why all this promised money was not being spent on the original project. She stated that as far as she was aware councillors have not been asked to "save" money and that WDC is not that "strapped for cash".

I am now aware that an article featuring Cllr Bromley making the same point was published on page 7 of the Warwick Courier on Friday 3rd August.

I made it clear to Cllr Bromley on 3rd July that I had clarified the position over the funding with my portfolio holder and deputy chief executive and that just because there was £98,000 left after having delivered the other two projects we did not automatically have to spend the £98k on CCTV but develop a suitable scheme for the area.

I clarified that given the current financial position the council was in I would normally expect to have to offer up the remaining funding as a saving but given the funds were ring fenced for St Nicholas Park I suspected that we could argue the money could still be spent there.

I confirmed to Cllr Bromley that given concerns about the current level of ASB in the area an under spend would not be immediately offered up as a saving so if after we evaluated the impact of the two Wi-Fi CCTV cameras on crime and ASB we could easily add more cameras if there was evidence they were needed.

I was therefore very surprised to be informed on Tuesday of last week that Cllr Bromley had contacted ADT who are the supplier of the CCTV equipment which had been ordered for St Nicholas Park.

This contact was without any officer's knowledge. When questioned by the ADT project manager who spoke to Cllr Bromley she stated that she was contacting them as a local councillor who was part of the St Nicholas Park Project / Friends of St Nicholas Park and was looking for some advice.

She then went on to tell the ADT project manager that there was considerably more money available to spend and that she wanted to spend it all on more cameras. She said was looking to get a ten camera system introduced which would be recorded rather than monitored and from which the police could retrieve images up to 30 days after any incident was reported.

During the conversation the ADT project manager let it be known that he was attending a meeting with our CCTV manager Graham Collis on Tuesday 31st July to discuss plans for the delivery of the CCTV scheme. Cllr Bromley said she would like to meet up with the ADT manager on site to discuss the project once that meeting had been concluded.

I was first informed of the situation on the morning of 31st July and therefore spoke to the ADT project manager to inform him that if Cllr Bromley was to turn up at the meeting or contact him he was to inform her that if she had any queries or questions about the CCTV scheme being introduced then he should inform her that those questions should be directed to officers not ADT.

At around lunchtime on Tuesday I received a phone message to say that Cllr Bromley had not turned up to the meeting between officers and ADT. However, I was then informed on Wednesday that Cllr Bromley had managed to get in contact with ADT later on Tuesday.

Whilst the contractor did not respond to a call he received early in the afternoon from a local number believing it to have come from Cllr Bromley as a result of Cllr Bromley calling ADT's main office she did manage to speak to the ADT project Manager later in the day.

It is clear from her reaction that Cllr Bromley was expecting the ADT manager to contact her after the meeting he had had with Graham Collis in order that she could then come down and meet up with the supplier.

Cllr Bromley stated that she had been waiting to meet him with the "park warden" to discuss CCTV for the park and insisted that the contractor should meet up with her the following day so she could ask him questions about the meeting that ADT had held with WDC's CCTV Manager and about the more general use of CCTV cameras. I am unclear who the "park warden" is who she was referring to as we do not employ a park warden at St Nicholas Park.

According to the ADT manager Cllr Bromley made him feel 2" tall and put him in a situation where he ended up agreeing to attend a meeting with her on site.

I have set out below the e-mail I received at 13.10 on 2nd August from the ADT manager regarding the contact he has had with Cllr Bromley together with an e-mail from her to the ADT manager sent on 1st August.

27/07/12

- Linda made contact with me via our Manchester Call Centre/my colleague passed me her details to call back reference the project for St Nicholas Park (Graham was on Annual Leave)
- Spoke to Linda who talked about the project and the works which we were under instruction to proceed with
- I explained my position at ADT and how I Account Manage your CCTV with Graham, she seemed happy to have the person who knew the site and the project.
- I asked her what her reason for the call was/her position.
- She explained that she was a Councillor and was a part of the St Nicholas project/friends of the park and was looking for some advice
- She asked if the cameras were fit for purpose, which I asked her to elaborate on and she explained that are the images prosecutable in a court of law. Naturally I explained my position in providing a fit for purpose system and anything less would be a waste of tax payers money etc. In short, yes there are.
- She explained that there was considerable money to spend, only some of which had been spent and she wanted to spend all of it on additional cameras, some 10 throughout the park.
- She asked my thoughts on IR Lighting with cameras etc and I explained that cameras are only as good at night as the lighting there. If you can't see, a camera wont.
- I explained that on Tuesday, I was meeting Graham on site 31/07/12 and as she was involved, she is welcome to attend, she declined but asked what time I was there till as she may pop down after as she didn't want to interfere with Grahams meeting with me. I explained I would be there till 12 so pop down and I will meet her. (my confusion as she believed I was going to ring here when y meeting had finished, however after discussions with both Graham and yourself, I wasn't comfortable getting into political issues)
- She rang back (27/07/12) and asked me for any literature to support that CCTV's effect on crime etc. I asked internally and we have no such literature for Parks but an external website link (I didn't send this)

31/07/12

- Rang Graham to confirm he was meeting onsite and told him about the above events which led to this and spoke to Graham and yourself while on site in depth.
- After leaving site at around 12:15 I had a phone call from a Leamington No. I ignored this as I was now aware of the situation and wanted to avoid any internal politics
- I had a further call and finally Linda go hold of me through Manchester. She was a little annoyed as she thought I was calling her and I was thought she knew to attend site (my fault)
- It was a tad fracas as she was naturally annoyed over the miss-communication on my part, understandably so.
- She asked how I had got on with Graham, I was more guarded now in replies.
- She wanted to know what was discussed in the meeting, I was again guarded and explained I hadn't been to site in some months and it was to see what we were now going ahead with.
- She explained that she had been waiting to see me along with the park ranger, again I apologised for the mix up. She was instant she wanted to meet today as it was going in the paper on Thursday 02/08/12.

- I latched onto this and questioned further leading her into my saying "this sounds political and I don't want to jeopardise my relationship with Graham or Warwick DC for the costs of some additional cameras...."
- She tried to explain that this wasn't the case and only wanted to meet for advice and I wouldn't be bought into it, she just wanted her facts together before presenting her findings.
- It was left me feeling about 2" tall and agreeing to meet on site at a later date for very vague advice on CCTV but NOT relating to the CCTV system you have placed an order for.
- She seemed to think the cameras were some £ 355 ish each, I explained that these were the ongoing maintenance ONLY that the installation cost was circa £8k, she then relays the £7k+ exact sum back to me.
- I explained any advice I could give, would not be based on the system installed or use of the wireless infrastructure, this would NEED to involve Graham for me to feel comfortable.
- The conversation was left for her to arrange a meeting and come back to me.

Email to Chris Neville from Cllr Bromley using her personal e-mail account sent 11.30am on 1st July.

Dear Chris,

Just to let you know, I checked my emails and it wasn't Graham Collis who told me that stand alone cameras do not take prosecutable images. It was someone else. I know that Graham was not critical of them at all when we spoke last year and I just wanted some further info on them.

My friend who co-ordinates Neighbourhood Watch is going to give you a ring if you don't mind - Neil Kenton on another issue as well. I hope you can find a few minutes to talk to him. He is working now until next week so I don't know when we could manage another meeting.

Many thanks.

Linda Bromley

PS I am using my personal email address for this which you could reply to if you like.

It is interesting to me that this e-mail was sent to ADT from her personal e-mail account although she had originally been making contact with ADT in her capacity as a councillor.

My concern is the kind of behaviours identified above could be a breach of the member code of conduct / protocol. This based on her contacting the contractor without officers knowledge to try and find out information about the scheme. Informing the contractor there was more funding available for the scheme and using intimidating behaviour to influence the contractor into enter into dialogue about the CCTV scheme with her and others representing external organisations.

Generally I feel that Cllr Bromley is trying to undermine officers by entering into discussions with the supplier about the scheme already agreed which is surely in conflict with the ten principles of mutual respect and trust which the members and officers have undertaken to uphold.

What is your view on how this matter should now be addressed?

Chris Elliott
Chief Executive

Warwick District Council, Riverside House
Milverton Hill, Royal Leamington Spa, CV32 5HZ

By email

Councillor Linda Bromley

direct line: 01926 456000

switchboard: 01926 410410

fax: 01926 456026

email: chris.elliott@warwickdc.gov.uk

web: www.warwickdc.gov.uk

our ref:CE/gsh
your ref:

29th August 2012

Dear Councillor Bromley

I understand that Ian Coker has written to you previously about giving instructions directly to contractors rather than raising questions or problems with the responsible officers. Regrettably, I must now write to share my serious concern about your recent contacts with one of our contractors responsible for installing CCTV in St Nicholas's Park.

My understanding is that you contacted the Account Manager at ADT, Chris Neville, twice by telephone on 27th July. He was under the impression that you were involved with the project and that the relevant officers would have been aware that you were contacting him. As a result, he discussed the camera technology with you and agreed to meet you on 31st July. He says that, during the conversation, you told him that there was a large amount of money available for additional cameras. It was only when Mr Neville spoke later to Graham Collis that he learned that the officers had no knowledge of your involvement.

I am told that the planned meeting did not go ahead because of a mix up on the part of Mr Neville. However, you contacted Mr Neville again by telephone to find out what had happened at his site meeting with Mr Collis, to discuss prices and to re-arrange your meeting for 1st August in order to meet a newspaper deadline. Mr Neville was not willing to meet before the newspaper article appeared and even then was only willing to discuss CCTV in the most general terms in the absence of officers. Following this, you sent an e mail to Mr Neville asking him to speak with Neil Kenton of the Neighbourhood Watch about another issue.

Mr Neville was embarrassed to discover that the officers were not aware of your involvement, that you had no specific role in the management of the project and that he had discussed matters with you that were potentially politically contentious and might appear in a newspaper. He also felt uncomfortable that you had informed him about the money available for more cameras and says that he was put under considerable pressure in his conversation with you on 1st August.

Needless to say, Ian Coker and Graham Collis also feel embarrassed that they were bypassed in this way and anxious that potentially sensitive commercial information, and an appearance of dysfunction, has been given to the contractor.

I appreciate that you may wish to add or challenge points of detail in this account. However, it is not my purpose to launch an investigation. Nor do I question your desire to achieve the best outcomes for those whom you represent. What I do want to convey is the importance of working on behalf of your constituents in a way that shows respect for your colleagues and our democratic processes, including the limits of your personal authority, as well as protecting the interests of the Council and your own interests.

As you will know, the Council has long had a Member/Officer Protocol which explains that mutual trust and respect is based on the ten principles of public life very recently affirmed by the Council in our new Code of Conduct. The Protocol explains the division of responsibilities between officers and Members and that officers work to the instructions of their managers and not to any individual Member. One of the principles of the Code is:

Valuing and respecting my colleagues and staff and engaging with them in an appropriate manner and one that underpins the mutual respect between us that is essential to good local government.

Councillors will, from time to time, disagree with decisions made by their colleagues and staff, or with the way in which a particular project is being carried out, and they are, of course, entitled to press for alternatives through the political process or through the channels available for them to work with officers. However, if a Councillor begins a dialogue directly with a contractor, without letting officers know, then the interests of the Council can be seriously harmed. Information may be disclosed that affects its bargaining position, confusion and embarrassment may arise, working relationships may be compromised and legal obligations may be inadvertently created. Most important, the position of officers will be undermined – especially where members of the public are given direct access to a contractor and information is being gathered for a public campaign criticising the project concerned.

I hope that you will reflect on what can be learned from this case, the value of relationships and the impacts that your actions can have on others and the reputation of the Council. In the end, this is about getting results for the community, and being the most effective representative that you can be, whilst keeping yourself safe from justified criticism. If you wish to explore any of these issues with me, or indeed with one of our lawyers, I should be pleased to arrange that for you.

Yours sincerely,



Chris Elliott
Chief Executive

LOCALISM ACT 2011 S. 28

WARWICK DISTRICT COUNCIL

Investigation into allegations concerning Councillor Linda Bromley

STATEMENT OF GRAHAM LEACH

1. My name is GRAHAM LEACH. I am employed by Warwick District Council as Democratic Services Manager and Deputy Monitoring Officer, a post I have held since 12th November 2012. Prior to that I held the post of Civic and Committee Services Manager and Deputy Monitoring Officer; and other roles within Committee Services. I have been employed by the Council since 22nd January 2001.
2. The Council adopted a new Code of Conduct at its meeting on 27th June 2012. On 27th July, I sent an email to all councillors attaching a copy of the agreed Code and asking each councillor to acknowledge that they had received and understood it.
3. By the beginning of October, I had not received the requested acknowledgement from about half the councillors, including Councillor Mrs Bromley. I sent a letter dated 2nd October to those councillors asking for the acknowledgement as a matter of urgency.
4. A meeting of the Standards Committee was held on 30th October. During the course of the meeting, the Chairman asked me to inform the committee of those councillors who had not by that date returned their Disclosable Pecuniary Interest Form or had not acknowledged receipt and understanding of the new code. I advised that there were still four outstanding acknowledgements and gave the names of the councillors concerned, one of whom was Councillor Mrs Bromley. The Committee resolved that "the Civic & Committee Services Manager writes to all parties regarding the outstanding matters outlined above, expressing the dissatisfaction of the Committee and encouraging them all to respond immediately".
5. I wrote to the councillors concerned, including Councillor Mrs Bromley, on 9th November. To date, I have not received any acknowledgement of receipt or understanding of the code from Councillor Mrs Bromley, nor has she

approached me to discuss any problem she may have with it. She is now the only councillor who has not responded.

6. The letters of 9th November were copied to the Chief Executive, the Chairman of the Standards Committee and the Leader of the Conservative Group. I had discussed the position with the Chief Executive before sending the letters, and he had seen drafts of them. The purpose of sending the copies to him was to prompt him to discuss the matter with the Group Leader, so that Councillor Doody could consider taking appropriate action within the Group.
7. As I said in the letter, I found the lack of response very disappointing, and it appeared to show a lack of respect to both myself and the Council generally. I was aware that the Chief Executive was considering another matter which had been raised with him regarding Councillor Mrs Bromley which contained similar issues regarding following procedure and showing respect for officers. It was therefore agreed that he should take this matter forward also. If he had not done so, I would have made a formal complaint.
8. From my point of view, I would consider it sufficient if Councillor Mrs Bromley gave the acknowledgement sought together with an apology for not responding sooner. However, ultimately it would be a matter for the Chief Executive, as the person who made the formal complaint.

Signed



Dated

19/2/2013

Civic & Committee Services
Andrew Jones – Deputy Chief Executive & Monitoring Officer

Warwick District Council, Riverside House
Milverton Hill, Royal Leamington Spa, CV32 5HZ

To Councillors: [redacted], Mrs Bromley, [redacted]

direct line: 01926 456114

switchboard: 01926 412656

fax: 01926 456121/

dx: DX 29123 Leamington Spa 1

email: graham.leach@warwickdc.gov.uk

web: www.warwickdc.gov.uk

our ref:
your ref:

2 October 2012

Dear Councillor

CODE OF CONDUCT

Further to my email of the 27 July 2012, a copy of which is attached, I do not appear to have received a reply.

I would appreciate it if, as a matter of urgency, you could either email or write to me to confirm that you have received the new Code of Conduct, a copy of which is also attached, and understood it.

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

Yours sincerely [redacted]

Graham Leach
Civic & Committee Services Manager and
Deputy Monitoring Officer



INVESTORS
IN PEOPLE



12

Graham Leach

From: Graham Leach
Sent: 09 November 2012 10:09
To: Linda Bromley
Subject: FW: Graham letter template.doc
Attachments: Graham letter template.doc

Dear Councillor,

Please see the attached letter a copy of which is in you post tray for you to collect.

Regards

Graham Leach
Democratic Services Manager and
Deputy Monitoring Officer - Warwick District Council

Tel: 01926 456114 ext. 3375
Fax: 01926 456121
www.warwickdc.gov.uk

Please do not print this email.

Civic & Committee Services
Andrew Jones – Deputy Chief Executive & Monitoring Officer

Warwick District Council, Riverside House
Milverton Hill, Royal Leamington Spa, CV32 5HZ

direct line: 01926 456114

switchboard: 01926 412656

fax: 01926 456121/

dx: DX 29123 Leamington Spa 1

email: graham.leach@warwickdc.gov.uk

web: www.warwickdc.gov.uk

Councillor Mrs Bromley
Private & Confidential

our ref:
your ref:

9 November 2012

Dear Councillor Mrs Bromley,

WARWICK DISTRICT CODE OF CONDUCT

Further to my previous emails and letters to date I have not received acknowledgement from you that you have received and understood the new Code of Conduct for Warwick District Council.

I originally made the request for this in July 2012 and personally find the lack of response very disappointing. The Standards Committee have also now asked me to write to you for expressing their dissatisfaction in this matter.

I feel that if I do not receive a response within seven days I will need to consider what further action should be take because this appears to show a lack of respect to both myself and the Council generally.

Please note a copy of this letter has also been sent to the Chief Executive, Chairman of the Standards Committee and Leader of the Conservative Group.

Yours sincerely

Graham Leach
Democratic Services Manager and
Deputy Monitoring Officer