

1 <http://centraldevon-libdems.org.uk/en/article/2015/1096976/lib-dem-council-leader-calls-for-investigation-into-devon-schools-unused-21m-reserves>

2
3
4 July 20, 2015 2:38 PM

5 Lib Dem Council Leader calls for investigation into Devon schools' unused £21M reserves

6 An investigation is being demanded by County Lib Dem leader, Cllr Alan Connett, into why so much money is
7 being held in reserves by schools.

8 ...

9 "It may be there is a very good reason for schools holding onto the money, but I was surprised to learn that in
10 total they have stashed away £21 million. The first thing Government will ask is why our schools have not used
11 the money they already have, before asking for more" he added.

12 As Shadow Leader of Devon County Council, Cllr Connett has asked the council's finance chief Mary Davis why
13 the schools reserves are so high and rising.

14 ...

15 "I am told each individual school should be able to justify its level of balances and its future use. I think now is the
16 time we need to look closely at why this money is being held back from the classroom" said Cllr Connett.

17 [The gist of an article published and promoted by Phil Page on behalf of Central Devon Liberal Democrats.]

18 ~~~

19 Perhaps it would help Cllr/Mr Alan Connett if he looked at his position in Devon County
20 Council as 'Shadow Leader' in contrast with: the corruption that flows from the Planning
21 Inspectorate in Bristol; the similarity to Dorset CID's difficulties with DEFRA & the bias
22 of the Planning Inspectorate; the conspiracy to defraud & nepotism of the Devon County
23 public rights of way department re Mr Richard Spurway & Mrs Emily Spurway [see the 2
24 areas of nepotism re the inspector, & his daughter working for the Devon County Council;
25 and the Teignbridge Democratic Officer Neil Aggett and Council Solicitor/Monitoring
26 Officer Sue Aggett as husband and wife. — Most interesting is the exposure of the CEO of
27 the Planning Inspectorate Katrine Sporle, & the Deputy CEO of the Planning Inspectorate
28 Leonora Rozee (retired July 2009) and their role in concealing the corruption in the public office: Planning
29 Inspectorate. To quote Ms Rozee: 1st June 2007 Planning Resource

30 <http://www.planningresource.co.uk/article/661275/things-i-know---leonora-rozee-planning-inspectorate>



31 What or who have been the biggest influences on your career?

32 My architect father was a specialist housing and planning inspector for 27 years. He instilled into me the
33 principles of fairness, openness and impartiality that underpin an inspector's work. *

34 What is your career highlight?

35 Becoming a planning inspector at 35 and rising to head of the profession.

36 *Clearly much ambiguity & controversy exists in what Ms Rozee has stated above, my personal experiences of
37 Planning Inspectorate/DEFRA's unwritten policy of inquiry fixing by fraudulent means, the threat from Devon
38 County Council's Mike Jenkins (retired early 2013) – an act of contempt/intimidating a witness* during a public
39 inquiry. [*Me.]

40 Is there anyone that can elaborate on the authenticity of the facts written in the following document; anything that
41 objectively assists to validate the nepotism and corruption that is recorded within?

42 The document surfaced during a routine search for corruption nexus 'Pins' the Planning Inspectorate and Devon
43 County Council. Many interesting facts are revealed within the following document (its author unknown):

44 Corruption is Destroying Britain

45 "I supported a community development initiative and became the victim of a personal vendetta" says Robert
46 Wakeling.

47 Teignbridge District Councillor and Ward Member Jeremy Christophers (Conservative) was campaigning to re-
48 open the pub in the village of Bickington, South Devon and Robert in his capacity as Chairman of the Parish
49 Council represented the views of the PC and the Community in support of the campaign. In a meeting held at
50 Teignbridge Council Offices with Council Leader Alan Connett (Liberal Democrat) and Chief Executive Nicola
51 Bulbeck, it became clear that Cllr Connett was against re-opening the pub and, unbeknown to the Parish and
52 District Ward Member, was already involved in meetings with the pub owners Heavitree Brewery.

53 What followed is the most awful and incredible case of blatant 'misconduct in public office'.

- 54 • Criminal cover-up by CEO's of Local Government and the Planning Inspectorate
- 55 • Deliberate acts of deception for the purpose of causing financial loss and hardship
- 56 • Cronyism and collusion within official bodies for the purpose of perverting the course of justice

57 Not long after the meeting Robert submitted a planning application into Teignbridge Council for a new residence
58 in the village of Bickington which, in planning terminology is a 'Classified Rural Settlement' and therefore
59 deemed suitable for development. The proposed residence was a live/work unit which would also incorporate the
60 family's business interests in a work from home arrangement. More than 50 letters of support from the
61 community were lodged with Teignbridge Council and not one letter of objection. Prejudice soon became obvious
62 when planning officers refused to perform a site inspection and prepared a recommendation of refusal based on
63 infactual statements and non-existent policy.

64 The Head of Planning (HOP) Steve Robinson claimed the application site was in a remote rural area and in open
65 countryside whereas in fact the site is an infill plot adjoining Robert's existing residence in the centre of the
66 village, and is a brownfield site and already part developed. To enable a fair hearing Cllr Christophers referred the
67 application to the Council's Development Control Committee where planning permission was granted. However,
68 Cllr Connett and cronies used an illegitimate Council policy held over from early times, to have the decision of
69 Development Control Committee referred to Full Council where the decision was overturned by a majority of
70 Liberal Democrat Councillors.

71 At the meeting of Full Council, HOP Robinson used falsified policies to steer the decision of Members untrained
72 in planning matters. HOP Robinson also sent Robert a letter stating why the application had been refused; - the
73 letter was dated and postmarked before the Council Meeting took place and the refusal notice was officiated
74 before the statutory consultation period had expired.

75 Letters of complaint were lodged with CEO N Bulbeck against the unlawful act of overturning the decision at
76 Full Council, that the decision had been predetermined and also for the misrepresentation and use of forged policy
77 to prejudice the decision making process. Later, the Council Solicitor and the Head of Planning rewrote the
78 published Minutes making some 22 major changes in an attempt to disguise the false reporting.

79 Robert sought counsel from Solicitors and Planning Specialists Foot Anstey who advised that de facto the
80 Council could be taken to court on several accounts not least that the application had been determined before
81 expiry of the statutory consultation period. It was decided that the previous malfeasance should be overlooked and
82 a new application and planning statement be prepared identifying the supporting planning policies and the true
83 facts of the case. The Head of Planning refused to accept a legitimate re-application and re-emphasised his
84 predetermined views against any application that Robert may submit. Eventually the Council accepted a re-
85 application for which the hearing, as witnessed by several in the public viewing gallery, was a sham.

86 The Chairman of Development Control Committee, Cllr Mike Haines (Independent) and other Councillors aired
87 their predetermined views whilst planning officers presented the meeting with immaterial considerations and then
88 Liberal Democrat members enacted a recorded vote to ensure the application was refused.

89 Around this time, Teignbridge Council were developing a new district planning framework document (LDF). The
90 promoters of the LDF were Cllrs Connett and Haines supported by CEO Bulbeck and HOP Robinson.

91 The strategy of the LDF was flawed from the outset and was being developed in breach of planning law
92 procedure whereby not only was there was a lack of transparency but the public were not being consulted. The
93 proposal was to locate most of the Districts new development in one location and with one landowner, on
94 category 2 and 3 flood plain. Apart from the debilitating financial cost of flood prevention, the promoters were
95 going against public opinion, a fact which dominated the local media. On behalf of the Secretary of State (SoS),
96 the Examining Inspector of the LDF advised the Council that to proceed with the LDF would be a waste of public
97 time and money.

98 The Councils Overview and Scrutiny Committee strongly recommended that the Examining Inspectors advice
99 should be heeded but Cllrs Connett and Haines together with HOP Robinson managed to persuade Full Council
100 that progress should continue. Adopted Council Policy and the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act gave strict
101 instructions that the draft LDF policy must not be used in the determination of planning applications.

102 HOP Robinson, supported by Cllrs Connett and Haines paid no regard to such instruction and began using the
103 illegitimate policy discriminately when it suited their purpose. Letters of complaint were submitted to CEO N
104 Bulbeck who refused to act on the matter. Following an official complaint, the Internal Auditor recorded the
105 evidence and opened an investigation into identified breaches of council constitution by planning officers but
106 CEO N Bulbeck stopped the investigation. A further evidenced complaint was brought under the Council's
107 Whistle Blowing and Anti-Fraud policy but CEO Bulbeck and Council Solicitor Sue Aggett refused to allow the
108 investigation merely responding with letters of denial and intimidation.

109 Alleged planning corruption in Teignbridge was a common day topic at this time and of particular note were the
110 inconsistencies of Highways Consultations with regard to access, sightlines visibility and matters of
111 sustainability. In the case of Robert's own application, the Highways Consultation recommended refusal on the
112 grounds of sightline visibility despite the sightline visibility requirement being exceeded and yet, outside the
113 village boundary, HOP Robinson was approving applications which could only achieve half of the statutory
114 minimum requirement.

115 Following several meetings of going round in circles with DCC Officers, Robert was advised by the Deputy
116 Director that the frustrations being encountered with his planning application were politically motivated. Upon
117 challenge, Highways Officers advised that Consultation reports would be so written to suit and enhance the
118 predetermined wishes of HOP Robinson, either for or against. Letters of complaint were sent to the Leader of
119 DCC, Brian Greenslade (Liberal Democrat) and CEO Phil Norey but the complaints were met with intimidation.

120 Eventually a fully evidenced complaint was lodged with DCC Council Solicitor Roger Gash who, in his capacity
121 as Solicitor, investigated the complaint. R Gash could find no fault despite being in receipt of indisputable
122 evidence.

123 A detailed complaint was lodged with the Local Government Ombudsman (LGO) Jerry White against the
124 evidenced breaches to Council Procedure but the LGO refused to entertain the complaint on the grounds that it
125 was a planning matter.

126 Complaints were lodged with the Standards Board for England (SBfE) against Cllrs Connett and Haines for
127 causing a decision making process to be unfairly prejudiced and for causing a lawful decision made by a
128 regulatory body to be overturned at Full Council. The SBfE expressed concern about the overturning of the
129 planning decision but could find no fault with the actions of the Members. Later a conscientious SBfE Senior
130 Officer informed Robert that information provided by the Teignbridge Democratic Officer Neil Aggett
131 concerning the referral of the Development Control Committee decision to Full Council, was both incorrect and
132 misleading. Democratic Officer Neil Aggett and Council Solicitor/Monitoring Officer Sue Aggett are husband
133 and wife.

134 An appeal was lodged with the Planning Inspectorate (PINS) against the planning refusal and background
135 information supplied as to the breach of planning law and procedures in arriving at the decision. PINS advised
136 that the decision making process in determining the application would not be considered. The Teignbridge
137 submission to PINS contained many fraudulent statements not least that the draft LDF had now been adopted as
138 official policy.

139 The Appeal was determined against the draft LDF policy and the Inspector (Christopher Gethin) failed to
140 consider material considerations as directed by PINS. In his report the Inspector recorded that he had not
141 considered the community prepared Parish Plan or afforded any weight to official community consultation
142 papers. Further investigations revealed that Mr Gethin lives less than 4 miles away and shares his residence with
143 his daughter who was working for DCC. Of even greater concern, both he and his daughter are political activists
144 and operate a private business in competition with that of Robert's own immediate family.

145 PINS procedural code states '*we do not use Inspectors that live locally*' and an Inspector cannot act in the same
146 planning authority area where the Inspector is resident and/or where an immediate member of family is employed
147 by the planning authority. In accordance with PINS procedure Robert submitted a complaint to PINS requesting a
148 Judicial Review to which PINS advised that the complaint had first to be considered before a judicial review
149 could be enacted. Robert complied with such advice and, encouraged by PINS Officers, continued to exchange
150 correspondence. After 6 weeks PINS wrote a letter advising that the timescale for a Judicial Review had now
151 expired and the case was closed. The decision identified that Robert had been deliberately deceived by PINS in
152 order to prevent a judicial review.

153 Complaints were lodged with CEO Katrine Sporle and Deputy CEO Leonora Rozee, both of whom entered a state
154 of denial and, in a telephone conversation requested by Leonora Rozee, attempts were made to intimidate Robert
155 against taking any further action. Following continual obfuscation* by Katrine Sporle and Leonora Rozee, a
156 complaint was lodged with PINS against their refusal to supply requested information. The complaint was upheld
157 by PINS but Sporle and Rozee continued to deny information and frustrate the case. Cllr Mike Haines and
158 Leonora Rozee are well acquainted through Cllrs Haines role as LGA Deputy Chairman for the Environment
159 Committee. [*The action of making darker; darkness, dimness; an instance of this. The action of making obscure
160 or confused; stupefaction, bewilderment.]

161 A complaint identifying 18 breaches of the Code of Conduct was submitted to the Royal Town Planning Institute
162 against HOP S Robinson MRTPI. Included was documented evidence to show that HOP Robinson had made
163 fraudulent statements claiming a site inspection had been made. Incredibly, the RTPI could find no fault.

164 The decision was appealed with the Secretary General Robert Upton MRTPI who identified the findings of the
165 (non-existent) LGO investigation as grounds to support the RTPI's decision. RTPI investigators Ruth Richards
166 and Sandra Whitehead were both working under the control of Leonora Rozee MRTPI (Executive Director) at
167 RTPI Summer Camp.

168 In a Hansard report Robert Upton describes Katrine Sporle as 'his very good friend'. Robert Upton now works for
169 PINS as a senior infrastructure inspector. Cllr Haines now lectures for the RTPI on matters of regional planning.
170 The findings of the RTPI are contrary to the findings of 4 professional bodies who have witnessed or studied the
171 case.

172 Revelling in new powers of being effectively licensed to act at will, HOP Robinson supported by CEO Bulbeck
173 started to determine planning applications without any regard to procedure or policy. On several applications
174 determined under delegated powers, referred to policies were not identified and in others, the claimed policies
175 appeared to be a total fabrication and non-existent. Requests were made to HOP Robinson and CEO Bulbeck for
176 the policies to be identified but the requests were refused. The matter was reported to Liberal Democrat MP
177 Richard Younger-Ross who advised that the Council cannot refuse to identify the policies. The Council continued
178 to refuse against FOI and EIR requests but the MP took no further action.

179 Requests and complaints were lodged with the Information Commissioners Office (ICO) whom, whilst trying to
180 give the appearance of assisting, only served to muddle and confuse matters and never sought to enforce against
181 the Councils deliberate defiance. Evidence provided that officers from ICO and Teignbridge were having
182 clandestine communications and eventually the FOI requests for policy identification were deemed vexatious by
183 the ICO who closed down the case.

184 A complaint was lodged with the Solicitors Regulation Authority (SRA) against Council Solicitors Aggett,
185 Barnes and Gash identifying acts of fraud, intimidation and cover-up.

186 The SRA ruled that they were not acting in their capacity as Solicitor. Indisputable evidence was provided to
187 further identify that all 3 Solicitors had performed acts of fraud whilst performing in their respective official
188 capacities as Solicitor and to which office they were contractually employed and attended to the business at hand,
189 in a mandatory capacity.

190 A review was sought but the SRA were unmoved in their position. A complaint was lodged with the Bar
191 Standards Authority against Barrister CEO Bulbeck for a breach to the general code of conduct (non-official) in
192 public life. The complaint recorded that N Bulbeck had, in closing down an official Internal Investigation, acted
193 with the intent of perverting the course of justice. The Bar Standards (BS) dismissed the case on the grounds that
194 N Bulbeck was not acting in her official capacity of Barrister.

195 Incredibly, the decisions of the SRA were upheld by the LSO and thereby removing all matters of accountability,
196 standards and democracy from local government. Baroness Zahida Manzoor is a member of the Liberal
197 Democratic Party. {What is the purpose of this last (isolated) sentence other than to identify Lib-Dem; she
198 appears to have acted in good faith re public standards, improving complaints procedure? }

199 Upon sighting the evidence, the Police Special Unit (Fraud Squad) investigated and prepared a statement with
200 111 (one hundred and eleven) exhibits of evidence in which deliberate acts of fraud, malfeasance and obfuscation
201 were recorded. It was identified that officials were acting knowingly and with the deliberate purpose of causing

202 loss and harm to Robert and his family. Upon receipt, the Crown Prosecution Service (CPS) failed to follow
203 procedure and stopped the case. The CPS claimed that there was no evidence of dishonesty. CPS policy
204 procedure directs that the plaintiff must have the opportunity to submit further evidence (if required) before the
205 CPS take a decision on a case but the opportunity to provide further evidence was denied.

206 Such as it was the Police considered that the position of the CPS was predetermined & understandably abandoned
207 any further progress. CEO Nicola Bulbeck was, by the claims in her own biography, the top prosecutor for the
208 CPS for 12 years.

209 So jubilant now were the Councillors and Senior Officers that any regard for the law or probity had gone. TDC
210 Solicitor Barnes openly wrote about altering the minutes and instructed HOP Robinson to ignore Freedom of
211 Information requests whilst CEO Bulbeck curtly refused to uphold statute.

212 Several other planning applications were submitted in Bickington and each one, without exception be it barn
213 conversion or a 1 bedroomed starter home was predetermined and refused point blank. At the same time, planning
214 permission was being granted to ethnic minority groups for permanent residency outside of the village boundary
215 and in areas classified as Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSS) and of Outstanding Natural Beauty (ONB).

216 Identified are several cases of Racial Discrimination (inverted) performed by Council Officers against local
217 people in matters of planning permission, highways consultations and enforcement.
218 With the co-operation of Richard Younger-Ross MP, a complaint was lodged with the Parliamentary Ombudsman
219 (PO) who took up the complaint against PINS. To enable a meaningful investigation, the PO requested the co-
220 operation of the LGO but the LGO refused and thereby frustrated the investigation. The case is still open to
221 appeal with the PO.

222 What happened to the 1st LDF Plan? Resulting from a public enquiry, the Examiner for the SoS produced a most
223 damning and scathing report following which the LDF was scrapped but not before wasting £millions of tax
224 payers money, wasting 6 years of Council time and preventing the development of businesses and new housing,
225 across the entire district. Even more disturbing is that the Audit Commission participated in all of the above and
226 when it was officially brought to the attention of the Audit Commission that the Council was acting unlawfully
227 and putting public funds at risk, the Audit Commission denied responsibility and frustrated the complaints.

228 What happened to Robert and his family? They have a planning application and subsequent appeal determined
229 under fraudulent policy that does not and never did exist. Robert's construction business was effectively
230 destroyed causing loss of local employment as too were the business interests of his family.
231 Of greater concern is the damage caused to the family by the sheer injustice, intimidation and obfuscation.
232 CEO Bulbeck and CEO Sporle were both advised in writing of the injurious effects to health being sustained by
233 the family and which is supported by medical records. So prejudiced now are officers of Teignbridge Council that
234 Robert can never have a fair consideration for a planning application.

235 And what of the District Development Plan? In May 2014 Teignbridge Council finally adopted a new LDF which
236 officially confirms that the policies used against Robert's planning application were fraudulent and had no formal
237 or legal existence.

238 The now incumbent Conservative Council took over further development of the LDF which had been restarted
239 under the Liberal Democrat led Council whereby many elements of the original plan were carried over.
240 Unfortunately the original LDF was so undemocratic in process that the LDF Plan does not serve the public
241 interest or the environment.

242 Whilst Bickington village is refused development contrary to the wishes of the community & parish council,
243 more than 1000 new homes are to be built on Greenfield agricultural land within 1 mile of the parish boundary
244 and in an area without infrastructural community services. Teignbridge Planning Officers & the Planning
245 Inspectorate cite matters of sustainability as grounds for refusing development in Bickington and yet the planned
246 new development on Greenfield land is further away from daily needs such as schooling and shops than
247 Bickington is.

248 Ironically, due to the traffic hold up experienced in Newton Abbot caused by urban sprawl and the lack of
249 infrastructure, local people now drive out of town to avoid traffic congestion and Bickington has become a rat run
250 for town dwellers going to work or doing the school run.

251 Further evidence of the negative effects of planning corruption can be witnessed in coastal towns on the eastern
252 side of the district. Towns like Dawlish and Teignmouth are heavily reliant on tourism and yet hundreds of new
253 homes are being forced into such areas which will detract from tourism and which local communities don't want.
254 Conversely, areas along the A38 Expressway where most of the major industries and businesses are located, well
255 connected communities that actually want development are being denied.

256 Up roar abounds in the local media (> November 2014) regarding matters of planning whereby adopted policy
257 appears to be disregarded by officers, both for and against. For the CEO of PINS to be identified in a criminal
258 investigation rather suggests at least a lack of impartiality or professional conduct in the determination of the
259 planning consideration! Fraud & Corruption within the planning system is often cited but rarely if ever evidenced,
260 as the above provides.

261 Substantive evidence exists to identify that Planning Officers choose at will whether or not the adopted policy
262 should be followed and irrespective of the result of any Public Consultation. Why, because, for reasons best
263 known to those involved, the officials are only interested in large number housing schemes and will actively
264 frustrate any small developments in order not to detract from or use quota for Officer favoured large
265 developments.

266 The consequential effect on rural communities is devastating whereby a given community is either completely
267 starved of vital housing or completely swamped beyond the capacity of physical or social infrastructure.

268 The RTPI would appear to be in an advantageous arrangement whereby Planning Authorities insist on staff being
269 MRPTI qualified in exchange for the RTPI turning a blind eye to breaches of the Code of Conduct.¹

270 A report prepared in October 2013 by Transparency International advised Parliament as to the epic levels of
271 corruption and cronyism within local government and government agencies.

272 In a survey of members conducted by the Chartered Institute of Building (CIOB) November 2013, corruption
273 within local planning authorities was identified as a serious problem.

274 Councillor Alan Connett's Gift to the Citizens of Teignbridge
275 The Truth Will Out

276 ***"In order to form an immaculate member of a flock of sheep one must, above all else, be a sheep"*** Albert
277 Einstein

278 Councillor Alan Connett recruited Nicola Bulbeck as CEO to Teignbridge Council in February 2006 and
279 henceforth the District has witnessed nothing but acrimony and waste of public funds. Formerly CEO and Head
280 of Service in Boston Borough Council, it is not known what the attractions for recruiting Ms Bulbeck were but,

¹ Is the RTPI a cousin of IPROW; an exclusive members club for those in public office networking corruption?

281 judging by the debacle regarding the major financial and legal discrepancies concerning the Princess Royal Sports
282 Arena in Boston during her administration, they were unlikely to be based on professional ability or merit.

283 Whilst Nicola Bulbeck has been CEO of TDC, £millions have been wasted in pursuing the development of an
284 unlawful Local Plan, reported acts of fraud by officers have been quashed and covered up, and countless business
285 expansion and development opportunities have been frustrated and which rather negates any criticisms against
286 Austerity Measures in local government.

287 The legacy of the LDF MK I lives on in Teignbridge, the true cost of which will haunt the District for decades
288 and likely amount to many hundreds of £millions if indirect costs are taken into account. In October 2014,
289 Councillors accuse planning officers of blackmail concerning planning matters in Chudleigh Town.

290 In May 2014 TDC adopted the Local Development Plan (LDF) and which formalises my complaint that; I have a
291 Planning Application and subsequent Appeal determined under policy that does not and never did exist. Contrary
292 to the claims of those abusing their public office, I am not a trouble maker but a British Citizen who is a victim of
293 deliberate and determined fraud, by Government Officials placed in the highest positions of trust.

294 And the Pub? Councillor Connett won the day and the Pub still remains closed at great loss to the community.

295 Notes

296 Nicola Bulbeck remains in office as CEO, her actions seemingly unchallenged and her position above the law.

297 Councillor Connett is Leader of the Devon CC Liberal Democrats and Shadow Leader at Devon CC. HOP

298 Robinson was paid off with a golden handshake, the amount of which TDC refuse to disclose. Katrine Sporle was

299 awarded the CBE for 'Outstanding Public Service' and is now Executive Director and Chapter Clerk to Salisbury

300 Cathedral.

301

~~~

302 If Katrine Sporle was awarded the CBE for 'Outstanding Public Service', as Chief Executive of the Planning  
303 Inspectorate for England and Wales (2003-2011) during the significant years of corruption and destruction to the  
304 Definitive Map (Review) of public rights of way for England & Wales, —should she not resign from her position  
305 of public trust 'Ombudsman at the Property Ombudsman'? The synergy of the above document with Ms Sporle at  
306 the helm of the corruption regarding the Definitive Map Review and DEFRA's inquiry fixing frauds is clearly not  
307 in the public interest to remain hidden.

308 Perhaps North Devon's Cllr Brian Greenslade could comment on what he knows re the abuse in & about County  
309 Hall re the public rights of way frauds; he appears a sincere honest man! — Would he be prepared to comment on  
310 the main document above?

311 I do not believe everyone, nor the majority of those, working in primary public office e.g., Planning Inspectorate,  
312 DEFRA or within/from the various 'county halls' of Britain are corrupt & dishonest, but where are the whistle-  
313 blowers, they appear few and far between?

314 Until we resolve/stamp out the corruption in public office – society cannot improve, public opinion will remain in  
315 a status of chaos and confusion with little belief and trust in the truth being heard.

316 James Field, June 2016