

# FORM A

## FOR STANDARDS COMMITTEE/SUB COMMITTEE HEARINGS

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

Please enter the number of any paragraph in the investigation report where you disagree with the findings of fact, and give your reasons and your suggested alternative. Please add extra "boxes" or ask for a longer form if needed.

Paragraph number from the investigation report	Reasons for disagreeing with the findings of fact provided in that paragraph	Suggestion as to how the paragraph should read
	I have already provided a relevant response to Mr Walklate regarding the final report which I disagree with. I am not aware of any additional information or recommendations since it was reported the Standards Committee.	
	I would therefore request that any additional information/comments/recommendations be made available to me.	
148	My letter to Mr Walklate refers. It is customary that confidential briefings are deemed to be such and especially when there is no need to discuss such.	The paragraph should be struck out.

<p>Provisional finding of the Standard Committee regarding paragraph 3(2) (d) of the Code</p>	<p>It is absurd, to say the least, that the Committee could come to such a conclusion, especially as the officer concerned had confirmed that this was not the case. This confirmation bears out what I have said repeatedly: that he was not pressurised or compromised in any way. The officer is an experienced local government officer who would report any member to the Chief Executive or Monitoring Officer if he felt that his advice was being compromised or undermined.</p> <p>On what basis and grounds did the Committee come to this conclusion? This is nothing less than a witch hunt. The allegation of a 'breach' is, I repeat, absurd.</p>	<p>There is confirmation from the said officer that Cllr Adje did not compromise his impartiality.</p> <p>Cllr Adje did not compromise the officer's impartiality in any way.</p> <p>The relevant paragraph should be struck out.</p>
	<p>It is clearly not in my nature to pressurise any member of staff, let alone compromise them. I have sought in all my actions as a member to protect the public interest at all times and to also respect the views of officers. There is no evidence whatsoever that I compromised the officer's impartiality.</p>	