

WARWICK DISTRICT COUNCIL
BISHOP'S TACHBROOK PARISH COUNCIL

REPORT

Case Reference: LSF.13.2011

Report of an investigation
under Sections 57A(2) and 66 of the Local Government Act 2000
and Regulation 14 of the Standards Committee (England) Regulations
2008
by Peter Oliver (Senior Solicitor, Warwickshire County Council)
appointed by the Monitoring Officer of Warwick District Council
into allegations concerning
Councillors Andrew Day and Graham Leeke,
members of Bishop's Tachbrook Parish Council

N.B. This is an edited version of the report, prepared specifically for the Standards Committee hearing, from which all references to a third member of the Bishop's Tachbrook Parish Council have been removed, as he was found not to have breached the Code of Conduct

Date: 24 January 2012

Edited: 26 March 2012

Contents

1.	Executive Summary	3
2.	Councillors' official details	4
3.	The relevant legislation	4
4.	The evidence gathered	9
5.	Summary of the material facts	9
6.	Reasoning as to whether there have been failures to comply with the Code of Conduct	11
7.	Findings	17
Appendix A:	Schedule of evidence taken into account and list of unused material.	18

1. Executive Summary

1.1 Various allegations were made by the complainant, Mr. David Norris, about the conduct of members of Bishop's Tachbrook Parish Council ('the Parish Council'), Councillors Andrew Day and Graham Leeke. Those allegations were considered by the Assessment sub-committee of the Warwick District Council Standards Committee on 3 May 2011. They determined that the following matters should be referred for investigation:

whether there was a failure to declare interests in accordance with the Code of Conduct by Councillors Day and Leeke when considering the provision of £50,000 to Parochial Church Council as a contribution to the new hall at St. Chad's Parish Church.

The sub-committee also determined that no further action should be taken in respect of the other allegations.

1.2 I interviewed the complainant and the three councillors about whom the allegations were made. Written information was also obtained from the Clerk to the Parish Council and the Secretary of St. Chad's Parochial Church Council ('PCC').

1.3 I find

(i) that Councillor Day had a personal and a prejudicial interest in the business relating to the St. Chad's Centre at the meetings of the Parish Council on 21 January and 20 May 2010. He declared a personal, but not a prejudicial, interest at the meeting on 21 January, but did not declare any interest at the meeting on 20 May. I therefore find that he failed to comply with the Code of Conduct on those occasions.

(ii) that Councillor Leeke had a personal interest which he declared at the meeting of the Parish Council on 21 January 2010, but which he did not declare at the meeting of the Parish Council on 20 May 2010. I also find that that interest was not a prejudicial interest. Therefore he did not fail to comply with the Code of Conduct at the meeting on 21 January, but did fail to comply with the Code at the meeting on 20 May.

2. The Councillors' official details

- 2.1 Councillor Andrew Day was first elected onto the Parish Council in May 2003, having previously been co-opted in about 2001. He resigned in 2005 due to ill health, was again co-opted in 2006 and re-elected in 2007. He has served continuously since that time, having been re-elected in May 2011. He was chairman of the Communication and Amenities Working Party, and following its split is currently chairman of the Communications Working Party. He has given a written undertaking to observe the Code of Conduct. He can recall having attended two training sessions on the Code of Conduct, the most recent in October 2011. He says that he was aware of the requirements of the Code, and if unsure would seek advice from the Clerk.
- 2.2 Councillor Graham Leeke was first elected to the Parish Council in May 2003, although he had been a co-opted member of the Council before that date. He has been a member of the Parish Council continuously since that date, being most recently re-elected in May 2011. He was Chairman of the Council from May 2003 until May 2011, and has been vice-chairman since that date. Councillor Leeke has given a written undertaking to observe the Code of Conduct. He has attended at least two courses for parish councillors run by Warwick District Council and the Warwickshire Association of Local Councils which have included training on the Code of Conduct, and considers that he has a good knowledge of the requirements for Declarations of Interests.

3. The relevant legislation and protocols

- 3.1 The Parish Council has adopted a Code of Conduct which contains the following paragraphs:

Personal interests

8.—(1) You have a personal interest in any business of your authority where either—

(a) it relates to or is likely to affect—

(i) any body of which you are a member or in a position of general control or management and to which you are appointed or nominated by your authority;

(ii) any body—

(aa) exercising functions of a public nature;

(bb) directed to charitable purposes; or

(cc) one of whose principal purposes includes the influence of public opinion or policy (including any political party or trade union),

of which you are a member or in a position of general control or management;

(iii) any employment or business carried on by you;

(iv) any person or body who employs or has appointed you;

(v) any person or body, other than a relevant authority, who has made a payment to you in respect of your election or any expenses incurred by you in carrying out your duties;

(vi) any person or body who has a place of business or land in your authority's area, and in whom you have a beneficial interest in a class of securities of that person or body that exceeds the nominal value of £25,000 or one hundredth of the total issued share capital (whichever is the lower);

(vii) any contract for goods, services or works made between your authority and you or a firm in which you are a partner, a company of which you are a remunerated director, or a person or body of the description specified in paragraph (vi);

(viii) the interests of any person from whom you have received a gift or hospitality with an estimated value of at least £25;

(ix) any land in your authority's area in which you have a beneficial interest;

(x) any land where the landlord is your authority and you are, or a firm in which you are a partner, a company of which you are a remunerated director, or a person or body of the description specified in paragraph (vi) is, the tenant;

(xi) any land in the authority's area for which you have a licence (alone or jointly with others) to occupy for 28 days or longer; or

(b) a decision in relation to that business might reasonably be regarded as affecting your well-being or financial position or the well-being or financial position of a relevant person to a greater extent than the majority of—

(i) (in the case of authorities with electoral divisions or wards) other council tax payers, ratepayers or inhabitants of the electoral division or ward, as the case may be, affected by the decision;

(ii) (in the case of the Greater London Authority) other council tax payers, ratepayers or inhabitants of the Assembly constituency affected by the decision; or

(iii) (in all other cases) other council tax payers, ratepayers or inhabitants of your authority's area.

(2) In sub-paragraph (1)(b), a relevant person is—

(a) a member of your family or any person with whom you have a close association; or

(b) any person or body who employs or has appointed such persons, any firm in which they are a partner, or any company of which they are directors;

(c) any person or body in whom such persons have a beneficial interest in a class of securities exceeding the nominal value of £25,000; or

(d) any body of a type described in sub-paragraph (1)(a)(i) or (ii).

Disclosure of personal interests

9.—(1) *Subject to sub-paragraphs (2) to (7), where you have a personal interest in any business of your authority and you attend a meeting of your authority at which the business is considered, you must disclose to that meeting the existence and nature of that interest at the commencement of that consideration, or when the interest becomes apparent.*

(2) *Where you have a personal interest in any business of your authority which relates to or is likely to affect a person described in paragraph 8(1)(a)(i) or 8(1)(a)(ii)(aa), you need only disclose to the meeting the existence and nature of that interest when you address the meeting on that business.*

(3) Where you have a personal interest in any business of the authority of the type mentioned in paragraph 8(1)(a)(viii), you need not disclose the nature or existence of that interest to the meeting if the interest was registered more than three years before the date of the meeting.

(4) Sub-paragraph (1) only applies where you are aware or ought reasonably to be aware of the existence of the personal interest.

(5) Where you have a personal interest but, by virtue of paragraph 14, sensitive information relating to it is not registered in your authority's register of members' interests, you must indicate to the meeting that you have a personal interest, but need not disclose the sensitive information to the meeting.

(6) Subject to paragraph 12(1)(b), where you have a personal interest in any business of your authority and you have made an executive decision in relation to that business, you must ensure that any written statement of that decision records the existence and nature of that interest.

(7) In this paragraph, "executive decision" is to be construed in accordance with any regulations made by the Secretary of State under section 22 of the Local Government Act 2000.

Prejudicial interest generally

10.—*(1) Subject to sub-paragraph (2), where you have a personal interest in any business of your authority you also have a prejudicial interest in that business where the interest is one which a member of the public with knowledge of the relevant facts would reasonably regard as so significant that it is likely to prejudice your judgement of the public interest.*

(2) You do not have a prejudicial interest in any business of the authority where that business—

(a) does not affect your financial position or the financial position of a person or body described in paragraph 8;

(b) does not relate to the determining of any approval, consent, licence, permission or registration in relation to you or any person or body described in paragraph 8; or

(c) relates to the functions of your authority in respect of—

- (i) housing, where you are a tenant of your authority provided that those functions do not relate particularly to your tenancy or lease;*
- (ii) school meals or school transport and travelling expenses, where you are a parent or guardian of a child in full time education, or are a parent governor of a school, unless it relates particularly to the school which the child attends;*
- (iii) statutory sick pay under Part XI of the Social Security Contributions and Benefits Act 1992, where you are in receipt of, or are entitled to the receipt of, such pay;*
- (iv) an allowance, payment or indemnity given to members;*
- (v) any ceremonial honour given to members; and*
- (vi) setting council tax or a precept under the Local Government Finance Act 1992.*

Effect of prejudicial interests on participation

12.—*(1) Subject to sub-paragraph (2), where you have a prejudicial interest in any business of your authority—*

(a) you must withdraw from the room or chamber where a meeting considering the business is being held—

(i) in a case where sub-paragraph (2) applies, immediately after making representations, answering questions or giving evidence;

(ii) in any other case, whenever it becomes apparent that the business is being considered at that meeting;

unless you have obtained a dispensation from your authority's standards committee;

(b) you must not exercise executive functions in relation to that business; and

(c) you must not seek improperly to influence a decision about that business.

(2) Where you have a prejudicial interest in any business of your authority, you may attend a meeting (including a meeting of the overview and scrutiny committee of your authority or of a sub-committee of such a committee) but only for the purpose of making representations, answering questions or giving evidence relating to the

business, provided that the public are also allowed to attend the meeting for the same purpose, whether under a statutory right or otherwise.

4. The evidence gathered

4.1 I have taken account of the following evidence:

- The relevant parts of the initial complaint submitted by Mr. Norris as set out in the report of the Deputy Monitoring Officer to the Assessment sub-committee
- The minutes of the meeting of the Parish Council held on 21 January 2010
- The minutes of the meeting of the Parish Council held on 20 May 2010
- The statement of David Norris, prepared following my interview with him on 19 September 2011
- The statement of Andrew Day, prepared following my interview with him on 21 November 2011
- The statement of Graham Leeke, prepared following my interview with him on 9 November 2011
- The letter dated 23 October 2011 from Melissa Odling, Secretary of St. Chad's PCC
- Emails dated 15 November 2011 and 22 November 2011 from Corinne Hill, Clerk to the Parish Council
- Observations received in response to my draft report

4.2 These documents are reproduced in full in the appendix to this report.

5. Summary of the material facts

5.1 The matters which I am required to investigate cover essentially two meetings – the meetings of the Parish Council on 21 January and 20 May 2010. It is, however, helpful to put these meetings into context.

5.2 There is a proposal to construct a new facility ('St. Chad's Centre') within the village of Bishop's Tachbrook. At the present time, the only community facilities in the village are a sports and social club and the

school. The proposal is to construct the St Chad's Centre on land belonging to the church close to the church itself and the PCC were the instigators of the proposal which is now being taken forward by a committee comprising representatives of both the Church and the community (which I shall refer to as the "St. Chad's Centre Committee"). Within the village, there are strong feelings, both for and against the proposal.

- 5.3 Councillors Day and Leeke were members of the Parish Council at all times material to this investigation. Throughout 2010, Councillor Leeke was the chairman of the Parish Council.
- 5.4 Councillor Day has been a member of the PCC for approximately ten years, and was a member throughout 2010. He has been chairman of the St. Chad's Centre Committee since its inception in 2002. Councillor Leeke was a member of the PCC some years ago (at least five or six years ago, and possibly as long as ten years ago) but was not a member during 2010. Councillor Leeke's wife became a member of the PCC and its Treasurer on 25 January 2010.
- 5.5 At its meeting on 21 January 2010, the Parish Council considered a request to provide £10,000 per annum over the following five years towards the cost of the St. Chad's Centre. Councillors Day and Leeke were both present at that meeting, and Councillor Leeke was chairman of the meeting. The minutes record that Councillors Day and Leeke (as well as two other councillors with whom this investigation is not concerned) declared personal interests. The minutes do not record the nature of those interests. Councillor Day told me that he declared an interest because he was known to be personally involved in the project as Chairman of the St. Chad's Centre Committee. Councillor Leeke told me that he declared an interest because he was on the church electoral roll. There is no record of any member declaring a prejudicial interest or leaving the meeting. The minutes also record that Councillor Day "updated the Parish Council on the progress being made with the St. Chad's Centre" and that "Councillor Day asked the P.C. to embrace the same process [i.e. committing funds to new amenities to facilitate bids for external funding] by assigning £10,000 p.a. over the next five years". The Parish Council approved the award of the grant, subject to the drafting of a letter of Understanding setting out the terms on which it was made.

5.6 At its meeting on 20 May 2010, the Parish Council considered the outcome of a Parish Poll relating to the Council's decision to make a financial grant towards the St. Chad's Centre. Again, Councillors Day and Leeke were present at the meeting and Councillor Leeke was the chairman. Towards the end of consideration of that item of business, a motion was proposed by a member of the Council that the Council should rescind its offer of £50,000. The motion was defeated. The minutes do not record any member as having declared an interest in that item of business, and I find that no interests were declared in relation to that item of business at that meeting.

6. Reasoning as to whether there have been failures to comply with the Code of Conduct

6.1 The issue for my consideration is a narrow one – has there been a failure to declare an interest (either personal or prejudicial) by either Councillor Day or Councillor Leeke at the meetings of the Parish Council on 21 January and 20 May 2010?

6.2 Paragraph 8 of the Code of Conduct (reproduced in section 3 above) sets out the circumstances in which a personal interest arises. In my opinion, within sub-paragraph 8(1)(a) of the Code, the only provisions of possible relevance to the facts of this investigation are sub-paragraphs 8(1)(a)(ii)(bb) and (cc) which provide:

(bb) *“You have a personal interest in any business of your authority where...it relates to or is likely to affect.....any body.....directed to charitable purposes.....of which you are a member or in a position of general control or management”.*

(cc) *“You have a personal interest in any business of your authority where...it relates to or is likely to affect.....any body.....one of whose principal purposes includes the influence of public opinion or policy (including any political party or trade union),.....of which you are a member or in a position of general control or management”.*

6.3 Guidance from Standards for England (SfE) includes the following: *“Generally religious organisations will not fall within the scope of paragraph 8. The principal purpose of most religious organisations is to provide a focus for religious worship and the common life of the particular faith community that the organisation serves. The influence*

of public opinion is normally not a principal purpose. Likewise, although a religion may encourage charitable virtues, this will not make it a body directed to charitable purposes”¹.

6.4 I have also considered guidance from the Charity Commission. Under the Charities Act 2006, charitable purposes include

- the advancement of religion
- the advancement of citizenship or community development

Guidance from the Charity Commission provides that

“Examples of ways in which charities can advance religion include:

- *the provision of places of worship*
- *raising awareness and understanding of religious beliefs and practices*
- *carrying out religious devotional acts*
- *carrying out missionary and outreach work”²*

The Charity Commission also advise that examples of the sorts of charities and charitable purposes falling within the description of “the advancement of citizenship or community development” include “the promotion of urban and rural regeneration” and state:

“Activities within the scope of organisations promoting urban and rural regeneration might include [inter alia]:

- *provide maintain and improve recreational facilities*
- *provide public amenities”³*

6.5 I have difficulty in reconciling the guidance from the Charity Commission with the view of SfE that religious organisations will not generally fall within the scope of paragraph 8 of the Code. In my opinion, the purposes of the PCC fall within at least the first three (if not all four) of the examples of the ways in which charities can advance religion. I am therefore of the opinion that the PCC is a “body directed

¹ Standards for England – Case information & reporting – Case review 2010 – Paragraph 8 Q and A at <http://www.standardsforengland.gov.uk/CaseinformationReporting/OnlineCaseReview2010/Paragraph8/QandA/#d.en.27143>

² Charity Commission - the advancement of religion http://www.charitycommission.gov.uk/Charity_requirements_guidance/charity_essentials/public_benefit/Advancement_of_religion.aspx

³ Charity Commission – “Promotion of urban and rural regeneration” (March 1999) - <http://www.charitycommission.gov.uk/Library/guidance/rr2text.pdf>

to charitable purposes” within sub-paragraph 8(1)(a)(ii)(bb) of the Code.

6.6 It is also necessary that I consider whether the St. Chad’s Centre Committee would fall within that sub-paragraph. It is an informal body set up to further the provision of a building which would provide recreational facilities and amenities for the benefit of all residents of Bishop’s Tachbrook. In my opinion it is a body promoting rural regeneration and it therefore falls within the charitable purpose of the advancement of community development. I find support for this view from the draft Articles of Association for the St. Chad’s Centre Trust Company (which I was given by Councillor Day). This is in the process of being formed as an independent trust company to take over from the St. Chad’s Centre Committee. It is intended that the company will be a charity. It is proposed that the objects of the company will be:

1. *The design, construction, development, commissioning and acquisition of a new community and parish centre to be called the St. Chad’s Centre at Church Hill, Bishop’s Tachbrook, Warwickshire;*

2. *The management, operation and maintenance of the Centre for the benefit of the residents of Bishop’s Tachbrook and surrounding locality and other charities and not-for-profit organisations operating within such locality.*

6.7 A member may also have a personal interest under sub-paragraph 8(1)(b) of the Code, where:

a decision in relation to that business might reasonably be regarded as affecting your well-being or financial position or the well-being or financial position of a relevant person to a greater extent than the majority of.....other council tax payers, ratepayers or inhabitants of your authority’s area.

In a decision in 2009 [APE 0450]⁴ the Adjudication Panel for England concluded that the well-being of the Treasurer of a voluntary non-charitable organisation who was also a member of a Parish Council was affected to a greater extent than that of the majority of tax payers and inhabitants of the area by a decision of the Parish Council about a

⁴<http://www.adjudicationpanel.tribunals.gov.uk/Decisions/i428/APE%200450%20full%20final%20decision%20.doc>

matter for which the Trust had been working and in which the member's involvement was well-known.

- 6.8 Paragraph 9(1) of the Code provides that where a member has a personal interest in any business of the authority, he must disclose the interest and the nature of the interest at any meeting he attends where that business is discussed. Sub-paragraphs (2) – (7) of paragraph 9 of the Code set out various qualifications on that requirement, none of which in my opinion is relevant in this case.
- 6.9 Paragraph 10(1) of the Code provides that a member with a personal interest also has a prejudicial interest *“where the interest is one which a member of the public with knowledge of the relevant facts would reasonably regard as so significant that it is likely to affect your judgement of the public interest”*.
- 6.10 Paragraph 10(2) sets out various alternative circumstances in which a prejudicial interest will not arise. By sub-paragraph 10(2)(i), there is an exception if the business does not affect the financial position of the member or of the body described in paragraph 8. The decision of the Parish Council did not affect the personal financial position of any of the three councillors. It is therefore necessary to consider whether the decisions of the Parish Council on 21 January (to award the grant) and 20 May (not to rescind the award of the grant) affected the financial position of the PCC or the St. Chad's Centre Committee. Councillor Day told me that the award of the grant would not alleviate any costs to the PCC, as all users (including church organisations) would pay to use the centre. I accept that that is the position. However, with regard to the St. Chad's Centre Committee, it is, in my opinion, difficult to see how a grant of a substantial amount of money to an organisation can do other than affect its financial position.
- 6.11 Having considered how the requirements of the Code relating to declarations of interest apply generally to the situation as it pertained to the events at Bishop's Tachbrook, I now turn to consider how those requirements applied to each of the three councillors individually.
- 6.12 Councillor Day – the Parish Council meetings of 21 January and 20 May 2010. Councillor Day declared a personal interest at the meeting on 21 January, but is not recorded as doing so at the meeting on 20 May. I am satisfied that throughout this time he had a personal interest both as a member of the PCC and as Chairman of the St. Chad's

Centre Committee. In my opinion, the interest as a member of the PCC was not prejudicial. However, I consider that as Chairman of the St. Chad's Centre Committee which was the body taking the scheme forward, a member of the public with knowledge of the facts would reasonably regard the interest as so significant as to be likely to affect his judgment of the public interest.

- 6.13 In his response to my draft report, Councillor Day argues that his interest was not prejudicial "because a member of the public with knowledge of the relevant facts would reasonably regard that I was using good judgement in the public interest" and sets out reasons based on other Parish Council schemes for which he has secured funding over a number of years. I do not accept that argument. Although I accept that the proposed centre was intended to be for the benefit of the whole parish, it nevertheless engendered strong feelings both in its favour and against. In my opinion, the principal relevant facts are that Councillor Day was chairman of the group promoting and taking forward the St. Chad's Centre scheme, and that he was a member of the Parish Council who was asking that Council to provide funding for the scheme. Indeed, according to the minutes, it was Councillor Day who proposed the motion to make the grant. I consider Councillor Day's previous involvement in other schemes of little relevance in how a member of the public was likely to view his actions in this instance.
- 6.14 I therefore conclude that Councillor Day should have declared a prejudicial interest at the meetings of the Parish Council on 21 January 2010 and 20 May 2010. In mitigation, it should be pointed out that (at least in regard to the meeting of 21 January), Councillor Day was acting in accordance with advice he had received from the Parish Clerk by declaring only a personal interest.
- 6.15 Councillor Leeke - the Parish Council meetings of 21 January and 20 May 2010. Councillor Leeke declared a personal interest at the meeting of the Parish Council on 21 January 2010. Although the minutes do not record the nature of that interest, Councillor Leeke advised me that it related to his being on the electoral roll of St. Chad's Church, which would come within the category of declarable interest as a member of a body directed to charitable purposes. The question which I must consider therefore is whether that interest was a

prejudicial one. I do not consider that being on the church electoral roll (as opposed, for example, to being a member of the PCC) would lead a member of the public with knowledge of that fact to consider it so significant as to affect his judgement of the public interest. I reach this conclusion because I am told that a significant number of people, both within the church and within the village were opposed to the proposal, and hence simple membership of the church was not a dictating factor in an individual's decision about the proposal. Furthermore, the financial position of the PCC was not affected by the decision. In my opinion, Councillor Leeke did not have a prejudicial interest. Councillor Leek's personal interest was still in existence at the meeting on 20 May, when he failed to declare it, and to that extent he is in breach of the Code.

- 6.16 There are a number of other matters which for completeness I should refer to as they have been raised during the course of my investigation. The first relates to the fact that Councillor Leeke's wife became a member of the PCC and its Treasurer on 25 January, some four days after the first of the relevant meetings of the Parish Council. Under the Code of Conduct the only time that the interest of a spouse (or other family member) becomes relevant is if a decision affects that person's well being or financial position to a greater extent than other council tax payers, rate payers, or inhabitants of the area. I cannot see that, even if Councillor Leeke's wife had been a member (rather than a prospective member) of the PCC at the time of the Parish Council meeting, it would have affected her well-being or financial position in the way required by the Code.
- 6.17 The second matter is that in his complaint, Mr. Norris refers to the fact that members of the Parish Council were of a pre-determined view on this matter. Pre-determination is not a matter which is covered under the Code of Conduct, and hence is a matter which is outside the scope of my investigation.
- 6.18 The third matter is that it has been suggested to me that other members of the Parish Council had interests which were not declared at the relevant meetings. I advised the person who raised this with me that I am only permitted to investigate complaints which have been considered by the Assessment sub-committee and referred for

investigation, and that if he wished to pursue the matter, he should make a formal complaint to the Monitoring Officer.

- 6.19 Finally, the question has been raised as to the effect of my findings on the decisions taken by the Parish Council. Neither my findings nor those of the Standards Committee can affect those decisions – they can only be overturned by a court of law. It is not for me to speculate on whether any different decision would have been taken had Councillor Day left the meetings during the consideration of these items at the meetings on 21 January and 20 May.

7. Findings

- 7.1 I find that Councillor Day failed to comply with the Code of Conduct of Bishop's Tachbrook Parish Council by failing to declare a prejudicial interest (and withdraw from the room) at the meeting of the Parish Council on 21 January 2010 and by failing to declare a personal and prejudicial interest (and withdraw from the room) at the meeting of the Parish Council on 20 May 2010.
- 7.2 I find that Councillor Leeke did not fail to comply with Code of Conduct in respect of the meeting of the Parish Council on 21 January 2010, but that he failed to comply with the Code of Conduct by not declaring a personal interest at the meeting of the Parish Council on 20 May 2010.

Peter J R Oliver
Senior Solicitor
Warwickshire County Council

24 January 2012

Edited 26 March 2012

Appendix A

Schedule of Evidence taken into account and appended to this report

1. Relevant extracts from original complaint by Mr. D. Norris
2. Email from Councillor Day dated 8 August 2011
3. Initial response from Councillor Leeke dated 9 August 2011
4. Statement of David Norris dated 7 October 2011
5. Statement of Andrew John William Day dated 22 November 2011
6. Statement of Graham Maurice Leeke dated 7 December 2011
7. Minutes of meeting of Bishop's Tachbrook Parish Council on 21 January 2010
8. Minutes of meeting of Bishop's Tachbrook Parish Council on 20 May 2010
9. Notification by a Parish Councillor of Financial and Other Interests by Councillor Day dated 3 August 2009
10. Notification by a Parish Councillor of Financial and Other Interests by Councillor Leeke dated 14 December 2009
11. Letter dated 23 October 2011 from Melissa Odling, St. Chad's PCC Secretary.
12. Emails dated 15 November 2011 and 22 November 2011 from Corinne Hill, Parish Clerk
13. Draft Articles of Association for the St. Chad's Centre Trust Company
14. Email from David Norris dated 4 January 2012
15. Email from Councillor Day dated 6 January 2012, attaching letter dated 4 January 2012 and related supporting Parish Council papers

List of unused material

1. Copy of Power Point presentation re. St. Chad's Centre
2. Letter of Understanding – Parish Council Grant to the St. Chad's Centre (undated and unaddressed)
3. Various correspondence with Mr. Norris, Councillors Day and Leeke and the Monitoring office regarding the progress of the investigation.