

## PARLIAMENTARY OMBUDSMAN

Complaint by Save Penwith Moors regarding Natural England.

The files put on this web site have been slightly edited and do not include the many appendices (copies of letters etc) that were sent to substantiate the text of the complaint. Personal names where not in the public domain have been redacted.

Click on links below:

[File 1 \(2010\)](#)

[Natural England 'answer' January 2011](#)

[File 2 \(2011\) \\_ Final Decision \(2011\)](#)

[Request for Review and final response](#)

[Appendix 15: Natural England Heath Project: Non-engagement with the public of West Penwith and alleged non-adherence to their own Communication Plan & Aarhus Convention. Some notes and comments from Natural England documents](#)

[Appendix 16: Natural England Communication Plan](#)

## **PARLIAMENTARY OMBUDSMAN - TIME LINE**

**24th May 2010:** Following the unsatisfactory way in which my complaint re ‘Aarhus’ had been handled by the Natural England complaints procedure I produced a dossier detailing the reasons for my complaint, and alleging maladministration by the Natural England HEATH Project in West Penwith, Cornwall. This was then submitted to my Member of Parliament, Andrew George MP (St Ives Constituency), who passed it on to the UK Parliamentary Ombudsman in June 2010.

**8th July 2010:** A second document was sent to the Parliamentary Ombudsman concerning alleged maladministration by Natural England of the Higher Level Stewardship Agreement & HEATH Project for Carnyorth Common, St Just-In-Penwith, Cornwall.

**6th August 2010:** PO sent an email to Natural England detailing my complaint and asking for their understanding of the desired outcome.

**13th August 2010:** After consideration by the Ombudsman a response was sent to me in which it was stated that in view of my recent meetings with Natural England officials and Natural England’s assurances to the Ombudsman that they are taking steps to see whether they can resolve matters to my satisfaction – and I had agreed to give them time to try to do that – the Ombudsman had decided to take no further action on my complaint at present, but that if I am dissatisfied with Natural England’s attempts to resolve matters I may make further complaint to the Ombudsman.

**11th November 2010:** It was once again stressed to Natural England that a resolution of the complaint to the Parliamentary Ombudsman needs to be satisfactorily completed by the end of 2010.

**16th November 2010:** Extreme dissatisfaction expressed to NE Director South West about lack of urgency to address the PO complaint.

**21st December 2010:** Email to NE giving a final amended deadline of 31st January 2011 for resolution of my complaints to PO and copied to PO.

**28th January 2011:** I received a response from Natural England to the complaints submitted on 24th May and 8th July 2010. I considered this response to be totally unsatisfactory and sent a reply stating that I would be returning my complaint to the Ombudsman.

**1st February 2011:** A large dossier of additional information for my complaint to Parliamentary Ombudsman & non-resolution of original complaint was sent to the Ombudsman.

**5th February 2011:** I received a letter from the Ombudsman acknowledging my recent correspondence and informing me that my case had been referred for further detailed assessment that will form “the basis for our decision on whether or not to undertake an investigation of your complaint”.

**4th March 2011:** A letter received from the Ombudsman with a summary of her understanding of my complaint with authorisation to correct/amend as necessary. I did this and returned this to her the same day.

**6th August 2011:** Letter from Parliamentary Ombudsman confirming they did not consider the matter “suitable for a statutory investigation”.

**10th September 2011:** SPM request for a review of the Ombudsman’s decision.

**23rd November 2011:** Final response- no review will be undertaken.