



# London Borough of Enfield

## Councillor Conduct Appeal Form

This form is to be completed in full if you wish to appeal against a Monitoring Officer decision regarding a complaint against a councillor.

<b>Complaint</b>	Breach of Councillor Conduct Code
<b>Name of Complainant</b>	Josie Nicolaou & George Christou
<b>Councillor(s) Involved</b>	Terence Neville
<b>Finding of Monitoring Officer</b>	
No bre ach	
<b>Complainant notified of Monitoring Officer decision</b>	<b>Date:</b>
<b>Reason(s) for Appeal</b> (Please list below and attach any supporting evidence) Please add more reasons if you need to.	
<p>1.</p> <p>The report is badly drafted and has sentences that are not even complete; mainly, this appears to be a collection of timelines and telephone attendance notes. (bottom of P3, bottom of P10 ('understand neighbours' . This shows a complete disregard of this complaint. Provided me with a timeline, which is useful, but doesn't add to the investigation of the complaint/final decision.</p>	
<p>2.</p> <p>Still not clear on which powers Mr Neville relied on to hold the planning indefinitely. There has been no explanation as to why Mr Neville was able to stall planning, despite the planning officer confirming that the application was in line with relevant regulations/legislation. Why was there a requirement for Mr Neville to be 'happy' with the application if it conformed with the requirements, as confirmed by JC? Why did it take so long for the matter to go to committee? The amends</p>	

## Appendix B

required by JC had been made and so why was TN allowed to defer the planning approval? There has been no proper response provided in relation to these points.

The point has been made, several times in the report, that the property is in a 'conservation area'. The relevance of this is not clear – as the planning application had been made taking into account any conservation matters and, as expressed in initial letter of complaint, others had extended, on an even larger scale, at the same time, and was not met with these issues.

Contrary to the comments on p9, TN did not 'raise objections on DB's behalf' it would appear that he simply wrote to AH and said that AH 'should reject' the planning – no sufficient reason was given in the correspondence as to why the planning should be rejected; DB's view has not been blocked.

3

P10 – 'there is a discretion for the chair to override the 21-day rule' – we were never informed of this, where is this set out? This is not made clear in the report.

P10 – changes made to report and so 'clearly were not ready to go to planning committee' – not the case. The drawings were amended for DB but JC was already happy with the amends and the drawings and, but for TN's objections would have granted planning, so this should not have hindered the matter going to committee.

P11 – Dina to check planning process – no response in relation to this.

P16 – I find the comments on P16 objectionable – in that DB could 'live with the planning application'. Herein lies the abuse of power. It is not for DB to be happy with the application, it is for him to put forward any objections and, if any hold merit, in line with JC's duties to consider in line with legislation/regulations, then this can force us to amend/reject. The matter was not for planning to remain stalled until DB was 'happy'.

**Date appeal submitted** (within 10 working days of receipt of decision)

**Yes/No YES**

**Date**

**What are the relevant matters that you feel should be taken into account?**

As set  
out  
above

**Details of any new evidence to support your appeal**

## Appendix B

<b>Comments/Advice from Independent Person (where appropriate)</b>

Please return to Jeremy Chambers, Monitoring Officer, London Borough of Enfield, PO Box 54, Civic Centre, Silver Street, Enfield, Middlesex, EN1 3XF or email: [Jeremy.Chambers@enfield.gov.uk](mailto:Jeremy.Chambers@enfield.gov.uk)