

Lantrequest6.

To Charles Lant Esq. Chief executive, Wealden District Council, Vicarage Lane, Hailsham, BN27 2AX.

Heath Close, Old Heathfield Road, Heathfield, East Sussex, TN21 9BN.

29.v.2018.

Dear Mr. Lant,

I hope you will forgive yet another approach from me on the same topic, but I would so appreciate a response to the request in my previous five letters for photocopies of the five documents documents that support my analysis of corrupt activity within your Council.

Photocopies such as these are normally supplied to anyone else within 48 hours at a cost of £0.40p each.

You will appreciate that tape recorded evidence of Ian Kay's serial perjuries and employment of a false instrument was returned to me by Mr. Ashley Brown. Now I am being denied access to proof that Ian Kay was a conspirator and a nepotist! Should Ian Kay choose to sue me as per Katy Bourne vs. Matthew Taylor, and evidence of this criminal activity not be forthcoming from your files, things might go very badly for me, so I would earnestly beg for the copies requested.

I am in danger of falling into the category of a lonely, "*vexatious*" individual. If the information that I am requesting "disappears" (as per the fiches containing the WD/87/3194 declaration), the Information Commissioner could find my arguments "*unconvincing*", "*not considered to be properly anchored in sound evidence*", and conclude that the "*the request could fairly be considered obsessive and manifestly unreasonable*". You can see my problem. It is you who control the disclosure of evidence. I am sure you are an individual of the utmost probity. Seemingly, this is a re-run of the Stream Farm Certificate of Lawful Use – you control the evidence yet will not release it!

If money is the problem I enclose a cheque number 006984 drawn on Lloyds Bank for £2.00. Please email me when the copies are ready and I will be happy to call at reception to save on postage. That will give me the opportunity to check the documents under your CCTV before departing to ensure that you have not engaged in another substitution fraud as you did c.14.06 hrs. on 24.vi.2016.

Yours,

Chester Hudson.

Recorded Delivery :- GQ 1361 0789 9GB.

We've got it

Tracking no. GQ136107899GB

Item GQ136107899GB was posted at Broad Oak TN21 8SU on 30/05/18 and is being progressed through our network for delivery.

Service used:

Royal Mail Signed For™

Updated on: Wednesday 30 May

- 09:28am
- SENT AT POST OFFICE Broad Oak TN21 8SU

Lantrequest5.

To Charles Lant Esq. Chief executive, Wealden District Council, Vicarage Lane, Hailsham, BN27 2AX.

Heath Close, Old Heathfield Road, Heathfield, East Sussex, TN21 9BN.

26.iv.2018

Dear Mr. Lant,

Further to my first letter of March 13th, my second letter of March 28th

received in your offices on the 29th. at 08.22 hrs. and my third letter delivered by hand on April 14th to your offices, and my fourth letter delivered on April 18th at 08.17, all

on the subject of photocopies of documents from your files, I would speculate that you are perhaps using the delay to seek Counsel's opinion and establish whether there are any conceivable excuses you can use to obstruct the supply of five £0.40p photocopies of documents on a public file. Is that the case? Because if so, might it be a plan to ask him, (or her), some additional questions such as :-

1) If you countenanced the “disappearance” of yet more corroborative evidence for Mr. Hudson's analysis from your files in defiance of Stephen Chippeck's “lock letter”, would this amount to a perversion of the course of justice?

2) Will all of the enforcement instruments countenanced by Ashley Brown and Derek Holness be subject to scrutiny or just those where there was obvious misappropriation of valuable uprisings (such as Emily Gallard (one nearly new Stately Albion mobile home to South Wales), A. H. Reeves at Aysgarth Farm (many tons of sand school sand to Messrs. Magner at Rock Hill House (delivered on the rates), and Brian Goodacre along Greenwoods Lane (one Massey Ferguson tractor with loader sold off on the spot to Mark Lower for £40)))?

3) Will all of the enforcement instruments signed off by “T W Dowsett” now be subject to review or just those after he lost his moral compass in late 1987?

4) If the entire upper echelon of a District Council had knowingly endorsed the activities of a corrupt planning officer, after retirement, could all their pensions be considered the proceeds of crime or merely those of the corrupt officer?

5) If the answer to 4 above is “yes”, would there be any time bar on the claw back?

6) If the entire upper echelon of a District Council had knowingly endorsed the activities of a corrupt planning officer, would the confidentiality normally extended to their “C” files, enforcement files, questions to Counsel and responses from Counsel be void both in respect of (a) historic questions and (b) current questions?

7) If the entire upper echelon of a District Council had knowingly endorsed the activities of a corrupt planning officer, would the ratepayer or the cabal of corrupt officers be responsible for paying the fees of Counsel when their successor(s) sought Counsel's opinion in relation to their predecessors activities?

8) If the entire upper echelon of a District Council had knowingly endorsed the activities of a corrupt planning officer, and that corrupt officer had sustained a case at appeal that “*was not well founded*” on 16th & 17th September 1997 by employing a false instrument, ten perjuries, non disclosure of his Rule 6 Statement until shortly before the inquiry, and withholding evidence that the Inspector said he would “*take*”, could any part of the

£5,997.95p costs obtained from the appellant at that inquiry be considered the proceeds of crime?

9) If the entire upper echelon of a District Council had knowingly endorsed the activities of a corrupt planning officer; and that corrupt officer had colluded with (a) corrupt solicitor(s) to generate a spurious enforcement scenario and generate enforcement uprisings, such as Summersales Farmhouse TN6 1UT, would those enforcement uprisings amount to the proceeds of crime?

I appreciate that after 38 years of contention with me, your resources are probably somewhat depleted so I enclose a self addressed, stamped, Recorded Delivery (no GQ 1361 0786 8GB) envelope for your replies. 38 years ago I merely suspected what was going on in your Planning Department. Now I know.

I append a definition of the offence of misconduct in public office.

I am sure that, as Churchill said of the Americans, we can always count on you to do the right thing,after you have tried everything else.

Please could I have my photocopies?

Yours,

Chester Hudson. By Recorded Delivery GQ 1361 0787 1GB.

Definition of the offence of misconduct in public office.

The elements of the offence are summarised in

[Attorney General's Reference No 3 of 2003 \[2004\] EWCA Crim 868.](#)

The offence is committed when:

- a public officer acting as such
- wilfully neglects to perform his duty and/or wilfully misconducts himself
- to such a degree as to amount to an abuse of the public's trust in the office holder
- without reasonable excuse or justification

cc Bushywood.com.

Delivered

Tracking no. GQ136107871GB

Your item was delivered on

27-04-2018.

Service used:

Royal Mail Signed For™

Signed for by: CRIMMEN

Delivered: 8:08am

Updated on: Friday 27 April

Lantrequest4.

To Charles Lant Esq. Chief executive, Wealden District Council, Vicarage Lane, Hailsham, BN27 2AX.

Heath Close, Old Heathfield Road, Heathfield, East Sussex, TN21 9BN.

17.iv.2018

Dear Mr. Lant,

Further to my first letter of March 13th, my second letter of March 28th received in your offices on the 29th at 08.22 hrs. and my third letter delivered by hand on April 14th to your offices on the subject of photocopies of documents from your files, I am bewildered at the lack of any response. Are you concerned that this evidence might incriminate your predecessors?

As I explained in my last letter, I was so hoping that you would supply my M. P. The Rt. Hon. Huw Merriman with proof positive of corruption from your files so that he could make a meaningful contribution to the debate in the Commons this afternoon about corrupt

professional facilitators. Unfortunately, due to your reluctance to disclose the information requested, all he will have is a succession of letters written to an individual of doubtful sanity (myself), from august and highly paid individuals with professional qualifications refuting his “*allegations*”.

You will appreciate that if there is no contribution from Mr. Merriman in the house this afternoon on a topic identical to that first raised by Charles Wardle M.P. on 9.v.2001, then members denied similar fact evidence relating to Mr. Merriman's constituency will tend to assume that all is now well in Egypt. Alas, as you and I know, nothing could be further from the truth.

The analysis appended to my (unanswered) letter to Dr. Staples at Freemasons Hall, 60, Great Queen Street, dated 15.iii.18 clearly indicates that by the time Ian Kay commentated on his father in law's planning application these people had certain knowledge of the relationship between Ian Kay and Past Master Denis Bernard Best:-

Without the Chamber:-

Derek Holness Chief Executive, had had 4 written advices,

Ashley J Brown District Planning Officer, had had 3 written advices,

K D T Tomlinson, MICE Technical Services manager, had had 5 written advices, 1 has now “disappeared”.

Within the Chamber:-

Ian Kay, by virtue of dispatching 30 written advices to other people,

Timothy William Dowsett, District Secretary South, had had 3 written advices,

Cllr. Herbert Smith, Leader of the Council and Leader of the Conservatives had had 3 written advices.

Cllr. G Hinder AIRCS, former Chairman of the AP(S) had had 3 written advices,

Cllr. Tom Woodward, Chairman of the AP(S) Committee and a retired bank manager had had 2 written advices,

Cllr. Prangnell, Deputy Chairman and Ward Member for Pevensey, had had 2 written advices,

Cllr. Bernard Trew had had 2 written advices,

George Moram White, Development Control Officer, had marked file WD/87/2089 in his own hand indicating certain knowledge,

Mrs. Susan Harvey, Junior Administrative Officer, had witnessed a previous declaration in The Register for Ian Kay relating to the same applicant on the same site.

Now all that is needed is the corroborating evidence from your files.

Would you not agree that this was a conspiracy of silence involving all the top tier of administrators and Councillors within the Wealden District Council?

In addition, you chaperone your Register and refuse to allow me a photograph of the corrupted line 71. You will not explain to a barrister why I may not photograph your Register. You will not allow me to audio record in your offices, which would be so helpful to me if I was accused of being rude or aggressive to any of your staff, and unable to prove my innocence because your CCTV had "*gone down*" for a **second** time.

As so often in Planning matters, it seems that another golden opportunity will be wasted because of discretionary administrative non disclosure. Discretionary decisions which have been taken by individuals who now seem to be of questionable integrity. What exactly are your reasons? Are you afraid that discretionary non disclosure is custom and practice within your Authority and a nice little earner in terms of departmental staff numbers engaged in malicious prosecutions that enhance the Head of Department's pension and kudos? Do you not feel that the time is right to discuss your Council's corrupt activities? Mr. Merriman may have to remain mute if you decline to confirm that matters within his constituency are far worse than ever they were in Charles Wardle's day, and he will not have the confidence to speak out. But there may be a further opportunity to redeem yourself.

A gentleman called Matthew Taylor is being taken to the cleaners in July 2018 because he said some very rude things about our Police and Crime Commissioner, Mrs. Katy Bourne. I have written to Mrs. Bourne and the Chief Constable that she controls on previous occasions and if any reply has been received at all, it has been most unsatisfactory. I would very much like to give evidence at Mr. Taylor's trial on his behalf. My topic will be corruption within the Planning Department of the Wealden District Council from 1978 to 2018. If I am to be taken seriously at this trial it would be very helpful if you could supply the corroborating evidence from your files by July, (or preferably earlier and then the CPS will be able to see that the whole event is a waste of taxpayers money). Do you suppose that this will be possible? If it is impossible, I may be back in the same situation as I was at my CLUED inquiry, where Ian Kay decided to "*fight dirty*" (to use Stephen Chippeck's words

after he had steered WDC vs. David Charnley through to a successful acquittal), knowing that corroborating information was being withheld on your files. This could prove **very** expensive for me and Weightmans could have yet another field day!

I will deliver this letter to your offices by hand and obtain a receipt. I will also post it to you by Recorded Delivery, and send it to other recipients. One will be Anthony Stansfeld, the Police and Crime Commissioner for Thames Valley who has done a proper job, and guided through a massive investigation into corrupt facilitators, who, according to His Honour Judge Martin Beddoe, orchestrated an *“utterly corrupt scheme that left small business owners cheated, defeated and penniless”*. Judge Beddoe then awarded them aggregated jail terms of 47.5 years for their £245M fraud. Another will be the SME Alliance, whose members were the victims of these corrupt facilitators. They have very little information on planning fraud and I hope to give them the benefit of my experiences. I will also email it to Huw Merriman M. P. and request that it be displayed on the www.bushywood.com website.

Yours,

Chester Hudson.

By Recorded Delivery GK89080801 6GB

Enc Appendix 2 to my (unanswered) letter to Dr. Staples at Freemasons Hall, 60, Great Queen Street.

cc Anthony Stansfeld Esq. PCC for Thames Valley Police.

Stephen Chippeck

Rupert Neate correspondent at The Guardian.

SME Alliance

Nicholas Wilson @

www.nicholaswilson.com

Giles York, Chief Constable of Sussex Police KK 33407288 3GB.

Katy Bourne, Police & Crime Commissioner for Sussex Police. KK 33407289 7GB.

Sgt. Amy Mason Sussex Police

Dr. David Staples, 60 Great Queen Street, London WC2B 5AZ. KK334072870GB.

Matthew Taylor

Cllr. David White WDC

Cllr. Susan Stedman WDC & Horam Parish Council.

Cllr. Michael Cousins, Chairman, Horam Parish Council.

Cllr. Bill Bentley, East Sussex CC.

www.bushywood.com



Track your Item

Proof of Delivery

Tracking no. KK334072897GB

Your item with reference KK334072897GB was delivered from our LEWES Delivery Office on 18/04/18.

Signed for by: REED

Service used: Royal Mail Signed For™

Delivered: 8:34am



Track your Item

Proof of Delivery

Tracking no. GK890808016GB

Your item with reference GK890808016GB was delivered from our HAILSHAM Delivery Office on 18/04/18.

Signed for by: CRIMMEN

Service used: Royal Mail Signed For™

Delivered: 8:17am

Lantrequest3

Heath Close, Old Heathfield Road, Heathfield, East Sussex, TN21 9BN.

14.iv.2018

Dear Mr. Lant,

Further to my first letter of March 13th and my second letter of March 28th

below, received in your offices on the 29th, at 08.22 hrs. on the subject of photocopies of documents from your files, I am very disappointed to say that to date you have not had the courtesy to reply.

You probably know that there is to be a debate in the House of Commons this coming Tuesday, April 17th. I was hoping to be able to supply Huw Merriman with proof positive of the corruption within your planning department, but alas, through your non-disclosure, this seems increasingly unlikely. However, there is a slim opportunity that he could receive it in time if you emailed the information to both him and I. You will appreciate that the debate is about **corrupt professional facilitators**, and having attended two SME meetings I know that their caucus of knowledge relating to corrupt planners is negligible. So, you have a unique opportunity to make the world a better place. I am sure you will grasp it with both hands. You will recall that Mr. Merriman spent six years as a lawyer unscrambling the unholy mess left by Lehman Brothers, so for him, getting to the bottom of your corrupt organisation will be a breeze. I have kept all his predecessors, Sir Geoffrey Johnson Smith, The Rt. Hon Charles Hendry, and Baron Barker of Battle well apprised of your planner's corruption, so it will be a shame if because of non disclosure he does not have the confidence to speak out. As I am sure you know, when a new M.P. takes over, his predecessor's paperwork is shredded, so the only continuity available to him is via the local knowledge of his staff. Would I be right in saying that he has that in spades, because he has employed Mr. Holness's old secretary Chantal Wilson?

You received a copy of my letter addressed to Dr. Staples at the Freemasons Hall on March 16th at 11.13hrs. , and you will appreciate that this leaves me in a very vulnerable position. If I am unable to justify my accusations (that your former District Planning Officer, Ian Macrorie Kay, was a nepotist and a conspirator) as fair comment, I could, in common

parlance, be taken to the cleaners. And it is only evidence that can be found on your publicly available files that can provide me with a defence. Any replacement evidence, such as an affidavit that I sent you based on my handwritten notes, might either get returned (as per the Sandcastle) or destroyed (as per the Steamhouse). Quite simply, there is no substitute for evidence authenticated by the LPA. An additional worry is the ephemerality of evidence retained on your files once it becomes inconvenient to your argument. One set of microfiches has already disappeared without any sign of concern from your goodself. I am nervous lest more sets should dematerialise.

Over 150 copies of my letter have been distributed so there is no turning back for me.

There has been considerable exposure recently of the Police practice of concealing the MG6(D) files from the defence. Files which may prove vital to avoiding flawed trials, unsafe convictions, imprisonment and subsequent appeals, all of which result in a huge waste of public resources. I enclose two articles on the subject from The Times newspaper dated 3.iv.18.

Indeed, your own Authority has sometimes concealed both information and evidence vital to the defence. Let me remind you of a few examples.

Non disclosure to the Crown Court. We are invited to accept your explanation that there was a “mix up” at David Charnley's trial T19990557 before Recorder MacDonald Q.C. On 27/10/99. “After describing a mix-up about the photograph which was taken a.m. on Tuesday 13th [April, 1999], he pointed out that in the end-of-day photograph for the 13th a vehicle was visible next to the large tree trunk shown in the photograph. He said: “*It was the same one as I had seen the day before*”. And he took you through the rest of the photographs to show the vehicle apparently in the same position as, he said, “*you could tell from the clump of trees behind it.*” Mr. Whibley subsequently explained that it was all due to the processing laboratory printing off a morning and evening shot from the same negative. However, when I penned a very polite letter to Cllr. Mrs. Pat Kennedy (Con.), and asked her, for the avoidance of doubt, to invite the Enforcement Team to put the morning and afternoon negatives shot from Mr. Gooch's land for April 13th on the back projector at the next AP(N) meeting, to justifying the explanation of a “mix-up”, her astonishing response was to tell me to “Stop muckraking”!! As you are probably aware, funding his successful defence constructively bankrupted Mr. Charnley. Perhaps this was your intention? If you have destroyed your files relating to this fiasco they may still reside at 5, Kings Bench Walk.

Non disclosure to the Magistrates Court. Richard de Rivaz. You will recall that in a land drainage case you dressed up improvements (to benefit George Herbert Day of Castrum Lodge) as maintenance, and sought to enforce. This extract from Country Landowner November 1997 explains the situation.“ An appeal was duly made to a magistrates court, but it then transpired that it had no power to order disclosure of documents. Disclosure of the council's documents therefore took place only after the Member had presented his case. The council then successfully opposed the introduction of a supplementary rebuttal report prepared for the member, and the appeal was dismissed subject to allowing extra time for the Member to carry out the works prescribed in the Notice.

The Member, finally in possession of the council's case appealed against the decision of the magistrates court. The appeal was successful in the Crown Court, with the council being held responsible for 80% of costs, with an abatement of his costs arising from his appeal to the magistrates court”.

So there was a Russian doll of non disclosures that would have benefited a local Mason if they had gone unchallenged. Does that sound familiar?

You are undoubtedly aware that had things gone against Mr. de Rivaz in the Crown Court it could have cost him £70K. A sum which would push many families over the brink as you well know.

Non disclosure in a secret Enforcement Report.

In order to procure the desired outcome at the initial consideration of the Steamhouse, a report to committee that your officers prepared was Muskill deficient in that it omitted all reference to the historic origins of the Steamhouse. Instead, the report was padded out with Muskill irrelevant information. I know, because you allowed me to see the report. The information omitted was that the structure was part of our industrial heritage and was therefore a candidate for preservation. The irony that the then DPO, Ashley Brown, was a student of our industrial heritage in his spare time will not escape you. The affidavit that I prepared and sent to you has been subjected to a devious smoke and mirrors routine, and you do not wish to accept a replacement affidavit from me. Failure to advise in a secret meeting is the same as a failure to advise in a public meeting. It is maladministration as INV/5/399/80 will confirm, a finding of maladministration that was awarded against **your** Authority. The supreme perversity being in this case, that the victim is unable to see the enforcement report, because Parliament assumes it is prepared by officers of impeccable integrity, and therefore he has no way of knowing what is said about him, and cannot complain to the Ombudsman about a failure to advise. The flawed decision produced as a

result of this flawed enforcement report has yielded a pretext for circa 170 enforcement visits. It became an industry for you. Perhaps that was your intention.

Non disclosure in a CLUED.

Stream Farm Certificate of Lawful Use case WD/96/0043/LD. Your problem was the overwhelming paper evidence meticulously conserved by your opponent consisting in large part of receipts on the backs of cheques that had been overstamped at the bank. A level of evidence that is beyond a criminal standard. This was perfunctorily dismissed, and , in order to sustain a case that, according to the Inspector, "*was not well founded*", your Authority solicited "evidence" from Worshipful Brother Harold George Wells. However, your barrister, Sasha White told you to get "*third party, independent evidence such as aerial photographs*" which you did, because I saw an aerial photograph on the file just below Sasha White's opinion. However, that "*third party independent*" evidence conflicted with H G Wells's. So what did you do? The local government owned colour, stereoscopic, enlarged, triple referenced aerial photograph was dereferenced and defaced until it was evidentially valueless specifically for the purpose of deceiving the Inspector and has been retained on your equivalent of an MG6(D) file ever since. Then Mr. Wells's evidence was re-jigged just before the inquiry. As a consequence of my tape recording of his cross examination on oath, Ian Macrorie Kay has to accept that my statement that he is a serial perjurer, the employer of a false instrument, guilty of an offence under S. 194 of the 1991 TCPA, all in an attempt to pervert the course of justice. These offences are not statute barred. They are offences which leave lesser mortals such as Michael Durham RICS and Martin Hetherton with a criminal convictions, but result in Mr. Kay passing all your due diligence tests and achieving the rank of District Planning Officer. You are doubtless aware that malicious prosecutions manufactured by (a) senior officer(s) of limited integrity will always have economic consequences for the victim. Perhaps this was the intention. The consequences for their author is an enhanced pension and prestige.

Non disclosure in open committee.

Despite thirty (30) interlinked written advices to various individuals Ian Macrorie Kay commentated on his father in law's planning application on 8.xii.87. And those in the chamber who knew? The District Secretary, Timothy William Dowsett, whose function it was to advise members and resolve possible conflicts of interest, the Chairman, ex bank manager Tom Woodward, the ex Chairman, G W Hinder AIRCS, The Leader of The Council and The Leader of The Conservatives, Herbert Smith, the Ward Member for Fletching Bernard Trew, the Ward Member for Pevensy Mr. Prangnell, the Development Control Officer George Moram White, and Mrs. Sue Harvey, Junior Administrative Officer. You are doubtless aware that outcomes massaged through by a senior officer of limited integrity

will usually have positive economic consequences for the beneficiary. Perhaps this was the intention.

Further non disclosure in open committee.

Baroness Serota's report INV/5/399/80 concluded that an officer had failed to advise a committee to apply a Grampian condition in order to achieve their objective. The complainant, myself, was charged with contributing a co-remedy as I controlled the land required for access improvements. The goal posts then moved through 180 degrees, and I found that my land to the west was also a candidate to contribute a co-remedy! Yet for some inexplicable reason, all 10 Hudson road improvement applications were refused and opposed by you at appeal. An eleventh approach was rebuffed as too similar too soon because Ian Kay chose not to investigate the fact that the firm requiring the improvements was about to "*fold*", (to employ their own agent's vocabulary) by calling for the accounts. Or perhaps he did investigate and failed to disclose their insolvency? Perhaps he failed to disclose in order to perpetuate the consequences of a previous non disclosure and exercise his penchant for vindictiveness? Or perhaps he was on a retainer from a convicted fraudster? You are doubtless aware that outcomes massaged through by a senior officer of limited integrity will usually have positive economic consequences for a beneficiary who has no intention of improving an appalling traffic management situation.

Non disclosure in a Register.

Non disclosure of an honest Councillor's identity. After failing to disclose his relationship with the applicant on 8.xii.87, Ian Kay set about adjusting the written record for posterity. Line 71 of the Register was Tipp-Exed sometime after 26.i.88 and any scrutiny of the elements that escaped adjustment give the lie to your explanation that a mistake was rectified. You continue to obstruct forensic photographic access to this Register and decline to give reasons. You are doubtless aware that yours is the only Register that I am not allowed to photograph.

Non disclosure of a Post-It note saying "Get Lost!"

That had been placed at the end of a line in one of my letters to Mr. Kay asking "*Have you anything to say whatsoever?*". Naturally, by the time Mr. Holness came to examine the allegation, the Post-It note had disappeared. He was greatly discomfited to find that I had a photograph of it. You are doubtless aware that had I not been able to provide incontrovertible evidence I would have been accused of making it all up and probably banned from your premises.

If you supply the photocopies requested we will have evidence that your predecessor, Derek Richard Holness, and his District Planning Officer, Ashley J Brown were intimately immersed in the 8.xii.87 cover up. Further obstruction on your behalf may lead to the accusation that you are an accessory so I would earnestly ask you to accede to my simple request. Furthermore, it will cost the taxpayer so much less in wasted costs if you contribute this information promptly. As we both know, value for money is one of the key drivers of our ruling Conservative group. It will also make prosecution of your Authority much simpler.

You will appreciate the supreme irony if the past Chief Executive of the Wealden District Council Derek Holness was to successfully sue me for malicious falsehood or somesuch, and the current Chief Executive refused to disclose information whereby I could mount a successful defence! It would give the appearance of being a cosy little cabal, rather like the AP(S) meeting on the 8.xii.87.

So if you could see your way clear to providing these documents we will be able to establish that your former District Planning Officer Ian Macrorie Kay had “previous” when it came to conspiracy and non disclosure and that will help the Police come to a rapid and just conclusion in the matter of their investigation E-42-5942-99. It will also provide a disincentive to other Planning Officers who are tempted to attenuate decision times and artificially generate distress assets of benefit to either cronies or intimately connected contractors. In order to prove this all we need is a little similar fact evidence from your files. Cleaning up your Planning Department will have the benefit of making your staff easily transferable. And you will have the opportunity of recruiting from respected authorities. One of the panel who selected the first female Chief Executive for East Sussex County Council recently told me that the panel decided not to countenance applications from Haringey, Hackney, North Shropshire or Kingston Upon Hull. And where did K D T Tomlinson hail from? Could it have been from The Borough Surveyors Office in Kingston upon Hull? That is the drift of an old newspaper cutting I came across, but that combination of surname and initials is very common so I am probably jumping to conclusions. Could WDC really have had recruitment problems that far back?

Kind regards,

Chester Hudson.

28.iii.

Delivered in person, by hand to the offices of WDC, BN27 2AX, on Saturday, April 14

By C M Hudson after delivery of a letter to the constituency office of Huw Merriman M.P. In Sea Road, Bexhill.

Lantrequest2

Heath Close, Old Heathfield Road, Heathfield, East Sussex, TN21 9BN.

28.iii.2018

Dear Mr. Lant,

Further to my letter of March 13th 2018 to which I do not seem to have received a reply, please may I request the following copies of letters and memos from your planning files:-

WD/1984/2849.

A letter from I M Kay dated 17/9/1984. I believe this is frame 31 on microfiche 2.

Also a memo on fiche 1 which reads "*IK wishes **NOT** to be involved*".

WD/1985/1244.

A letter from I M Kay dated 26/4/1985. I believe this is frame 12 on microfiche 1.

WD/1985/2918.

A letter from I M Kay dated 17/10/1985. I believe this is frame 12 or 13 on fiche 1.

WD/1986/0027.

A letter from I M Kay dated 14/2/1986. I believe this is frame 6 on microfiche 2.

WD/1987/2089.

A memo initialled GMW that reads "*NO IK involvement please, speak GMW father-in-law*". I believe this is frame 5 on microfiche 3.

WD/1987/3194.

A letter from I M Kay dated circa 17/10/87 to K D Tomlinson. and the response back from Mr. Tomlinson to I M Kay dated circa 22/10/87.

WD/1989/3522.

A letter from T W Dowsett to the Ombudsman Dr. D C M Yardley dated 6/7/90 containing the text "*.... a formal declaration of interest was not made then the question is one for the Police and D.P.P. in the first instance.*" I believe this is frame 21 on fiche 3.

I appreciate there will be a charge for these copies and no doubt you will require to be paid in advance.

This letter will be sent by recorded delivery KK 3340 7277 8GB for the avoidance of doubt.

Thanking you for your assistance,

C M Hudson.

Lantrequest1

Heath Close, Old Heathfield Road, Heathfield, East Sussex, TN21 9BN.

13.iii.2018

Dear Mr. Lant,

Please may I request the following copies of letters and memos from your planning files:-

WD/1984/2849.

A letter from I M Kay dated 17/9/1984. I believe this is frame 31 on microfiche 2.

Also a memo on fiche 1 which reads "*IK wishes **NOT** to be involved*".

WD/1985/1244.

A letter from I M Kay dated 26/4/1985. I believe this is frame 12 on microfiche 1.

WD/1985/2918.

A letter from I M Kay dated 17/10/1985. I believe this is frame 12 or 13 on fiche 1.

WD/1986/0027.

A letter from I M Kay dated 14/2/1986. I believe this is frame 6 on microfiche 2.

WD/1987/2089.

A memo initialled GMW that reads "*NO IK involvement please, speak GMW father-in-law*". I believe this is frame 5 on microfiche 3.

WD/1987/3194.

A letter from I M Kay dated circa 17/10/87 to K D Tomlinson. and the response back from Mr. Tomlinson to I M Kay dated circa 22/10/87.

WD/1989/3522.

A letter from T W Dowsett to the Ombudsman Dr. D C M Yardley dated 6/7/90 containing the text "*.... a formal declaration of interest was not made then the question is one for the Police and D.P.P. in the first instance.*" I believe this is frame 21 on fiche 3.

I appreciate there will be a charge for these copies and no doubt you will require to be paid in advance.

This letter will be sent by recorded delivery GK 8908 0804 7GB for the avoidance of doubt.

Thanking you for your assistance,

C M Hudson.

We've got it

Tracking no. GK890808047GB

Your item was posted at Post Office® branch, **Horam Post Office TN21 0EH** on 13-03-2018. **More information will be available once delivery has been attempted.**

Service used:

Royal Mail Signed For™

Updated on: Tuesday 13 March. Screenshot taken on 29/3/2019