

This file includes comments about the then-chairman.

Although they appeared in the complaints forms, the Monitoring Officer did not investigate the statements – possibly they were used as background

	EGM on The Green	Visit to flood problem	Leaked emails	Gateway scheme unlawful	Comments about the chairman
C1	yes	yes	yes		yes
C2	yes		yes	yes	yes
C3		yes	yes	yes	yes
C4			yes		yes

#### Chairman's demeanour (1 of 4)

Complainant:C1	Response
<p>I have witnessed firsthand and been a victim of, or privy to Dr Clews being rude, aggressive and dismissive to residents both in and outside of Sambourne Parish Council meetings. I have witnessed residents moved to tears when Dr Clews has spoken with them in a demeaning and totally inappropriate way. He has a leadership style which is dictatorial in nature and constantly refuses to hear the views of residents, preferring instead to be condescending and choosing to put down those parishioners who have attended for all the right reasons.</p>	<p>There have been no complaints to me, the clerk or SPC. Fellow councillors would certainly not tolerate this kind of behaviour.</p> <p>Whilst people may not agree with some of my decisions, I always abide by consensus opinion.</p>

#### Chairman's demeanour (2 of 4)

Complainant:C2	Response
<p>I believe that Dr Clews is rude, arrogant, aggressive, and has very little regard or interest in the residents of Sambourne, in particular to those in the hamlet of Middletown. I have witnessed on many occasions, his dismissive attitude towards residents, either at Parish Council meetings, or interacting with them in the Parish.</p>	<p>There have been no complaints to me, the clerk or SPC. Fellow councillors would certainly not tolerate this kind of behaviour.</p> <p>Whilst people may not agree with some of my decisions, I always abide by consensus opinion.</p>

<b>Chairman's demeanour (3 of 4)</b>	
<b>Complainant:C3</b>	<b>Response</b>
<p>Dr Clews has a blatant disregard towards the residents of Middletown, he has chosen to continue as chairman of OUR parish, he therefore should be both representing all of his residents and supporting them if there is a problem. The arrogance and dictatorial attitude towards residents and other members of the council is not acceptable and does not give a fair benchmark when discussing council business when it comes to decisions that involve members of the parish of Sambourne.</p> <p>Members of 'Sambourne and Middletown matters' (facebook page) had a considerable amount of discussion which was suddenly taken down which showed total disregard to members that had been involved.</p>	<p>There have been no complaints to me, the clerk or SPC.</p> <p>Fellow councillors would certainly not tolerate this kind of behaviour.</p> <p>Whilst people may not agree with some of my decisions, I always abide by consensus opinion.</p> <p>The removal of this material – much of which was vexatious – would require administrator privilege. Only one member of SPC had these rights...and not the chairman.</p>

<b>Chairman's demeanour (4 of 4)</b>	
<b>Complainant:C4</b>	<b>Response</b>
<p>I made an enquiry on my local Sambourne and Middletown Matters Social Media page, in regards to flooding in our community. My comment made was courteous, and I was one of a number of people having a discussion.</p> <p>The email I have attached below is what Mr Clews, the Chair of Sambourne Parish Council, sent to another councillor and it has been brought to my attention. I find his tone threatening and it has caused me a great deal of distress.</p> <p>I have lodged a complaint to another Councillor, [REDACTED], but he dismissed my complaint as meaningless.</p>	<p>This person did not just make a single enquiry. Many of their postings were unfairly critical of SPC. The parish council policy was, wherever avoidable, not to enter discussions on (closed group) social media but to raise issues in public meeting.</p> <p>In light of these postings I did make a throwaway remark that this person's mouth should be sewn up. The email containing the remark was sent – on 21st June 2018 - only to one person [C1] who later (30<sup>th</sup> August 2020) decided to bring it to this person's attention. After 2 years? For what purpose? With respect I find it difficult to see how a throwaway remark (not sent to this person – C4) should prompt this response. After all, the "threat" was made 2 years before and not carried out.</p> <p>It is on a par with the kids' nursery rhyme "Tell-tale-tit! Your tongue shall be slit".</p> <p>I have discussed this with the councillor concerned. The sender (C4) – marking the email as "Private and Confidential" - expressed concern as to "the consequences of it falling into the wrong hands, for example the press"! Surely no one would do that? Heaven forbid!</p> <p>The councillor assured me that he did not reply to the email so it was not "dismissed"; an appropriate response.</p>