

Peter Robinson
16 Hornbeam Drive
Cottingham
HU16 4RU

01482 848281
peter@snuffmill2.karoo.co.uk

27th April 2017

Caroline Lacey
Chief Executive
East Riding of Yorkshire Council
County Hall
Beverley
HU17 9BA

Dear Mrs Lacey

Malfeasance in public office by the Leader of the Council, Councillor Stephen Parnaby
Unjust use of the planning system by senior council officers.

I refer to my previous letter of 18 April 2017 and your reply in the final two paragraphs of your letter dated 26 April 2017.

Your previous two paragraphs referring to credible claims of serious and organised criminal activity will be replied to separately.

You have indeed replied to my letter within the allotted time of ten days however it does not provide the necessary sufficient and satisfactory explanation requested and therefore, as previously stated, legal action will be taken.

The ERYC website promotes the use of the Pre-application System due to generally more complex issues with major planning applications and states that in order to deal with these in a timely manner, early discussion with the planning authority is key, enabling challenges to be identified and overcome early in the planning process.

Your reasoning in your letter is flawed, you should not allow yourself to be hoodwinked. Everyone using the Pre Application Service for a major application gets a written response, it is the meeting that is optional. It is for this reason that a missing report is wholly suspect and indicative of corruption when considering that someone had planned to use their delegated powers to refuse this application whilst keeping the paying applicant in the dark.

This application was seriously prejudiced from the start and Cllr Parnaby was the only person threatening to do this because of my refusal to allow him any involvement in the project.

You should acquaint yourself with the document on the website of that date under the heading “**what you will receive from the service**”, item four states “**We will provide detailed written confirmation within ten working days of the meeting of our advice and views**”

It is clearly indicated on my pre-application form dated 21/12/12 that a meeting and written response was required. The correct charge for this was £500 and my Lloyds Bank cheque No. 000482 for this amount dated 28/12/12 was cleared at the bank on 11/1/13.

You further state that there is no indication that the agent was chasing a formal report, when you accepted my cheque and application form stating that we required a Meeting and Written response your contract was to provide this within ten working days of the meeting and says nothing about two people having to chase it for months and still not get it.

It so happens that I do have the information you say is lacking including emails and telephone conversations like the three on 18/4/13 when I, annoyed by the lack of progress by the agent, telephoned Stephen Hunt complaining about the non-receipt of the written response. He stated that Emma Lancaster should have done it and also added that the next 7-8 months presented a window of opportunity to get the plans through and that officers could recommend approval easier than changing the proposed local plan.

I then rang Emma Lancaster who said she was not aware we had paid the fee and then contradicted herself by stating that she was waiting for us to get back to her to arrange a follow up meeting.

I rang Stephen Hunt back who said there was no mention of a follow up and as far as he was aware we had paid and all the officers were at the meeting and the report should have followed.

We were obviously getting messed around and eventually another meeting was scheduled. This time with someone we had never met and would not meet again. She did make a drink but we still didn't get the written response. I am not aware of the advice which you say was provided to my agent do you have a copy to confirm this or are you just being misled again?

It might seem odd to you that four years have passed but you should not make too much of this. Events such as those experienced would inevitably have a serious effect on anyone's health and finances. I am sure this will be brought up in the legal proceedings.

The evidence available will, you must realise, result in only one conclusion and for you to use council taxpayers money to defend the indefensible should cost you your job should you not succeed.

Yours sincerely

Peter Robinson