

Complaint GOV 42

Factfinding following Meeting with Councillor Leigh Donger (LD)

And Monitoring Officer (MO)

LD stated that he was confused as to the complaint as he had not been made aware of the names of the contractors therefore there was no need to declare an interest and he couldn't see that there was any more to the complaint. He said he was unaware that his father in law had put in a quote. He understood that he had done work for the Parish Council in the past but was not made aware of his involvement for this work. He said it had been decided that the contractors' names would not be announced and only the Clerk and one Councillor knew who they were therefore he wasn't aware of the contractors' names. He explained that when his father in law's name had been mentioned at a meeting in the past, he would not vote.

LD said that at this meeting he did not know the contractors' names therefore he could not declare an interest. LD explained that it was a close community in Bottesford and people and local businesses knew each other and for this reason it was for the best that contractors were not named to enable all Parish Councillors to take part in the meeting.

LD stated that they were under the threshold of £5,000 for the works. MO said that Mr. Daly had provided some new information since the complaint, which suggested that the works were now costing over the £5,000 threshold.

LD referred to the Facebook extract in the papers and stated that he had never denied that he was related to his father in law.