

From: lisa cullumbine
Sent: 20 November 2017 14:38
To: Tara Bird
Subject: Fwd: Reasons for our complaint

From: lisa cullumbine
Date: 20 November 2017 at 3.38

Subject: Reasons for our complaint

- 1- We believe the Council did not read the information provided 2 weeks prior to the meeting, if they had, they would be fully aware that a decision in high court was made in April 2005 in favour of the river and lake swimming association, Richard Holmes assured us the study would be done by them also to satisfy. The questions raised in debate by councillors in the meeting had already been answered by the information sent, therefore proving that it had not been read.
- 2- Bob Boyce took over half the allotted full council debate time stating reasons to not support the petition that had been covered and answered in our speech and via the documents which answered his questions, thus leaving little time for a full debate within the council - again documents not read.
- 3- The risk level to the council is proved to be "minimal" when a full honest risk assessment is done and appropriate signage erected as demonstrated by the high court decision (which the council were aware of in 2005) and recent swimming lake incidents (again evidenced in attachments). It was stated as "minimal risk" because if the risk assessment is not done, or the signage is not erected and maintained then there would be risk - as was demonstrated when MDC were prosecuted for failing to remove a broken post; as a risk assessment was not done and all risks were not removed. Therefore why is "risk" being questioned, when it has been proved numerous times now that the swimming lake would not pose a legal risk to the council or councillors, any more than what the council are currently managing ?
- 4- The petition was not considered seriously at the meeting as 670 signatures were not counted at all due to being outside the Essex area, even though these people originally came from Maldon; so are the council saying they do not want visitors from outside Maldon?
- 5- How do the council manage the risk and run Wood up at Tollesbury which is exactly the same as Maldon as they DO NOT have lifeguards, (they have signage and regular risk assessments) if they can manage this (via the Parish Council) then I'm sure MDC can manage a swimming lake at the Prom as they have previously done so for nearly 100 years successfully.
- 6- We do strongly believe that the MDC should have created the working party to seriously consider the implications and the pros and cons of the lake, and instigated their own thorough research including the revenue potential to the town, before making a decision based on the same reasons as were given in 2002 (without considering changes in guidance or documentation provided to the council) instead it was unfairly majority voted out on the night. A working party would have shown consideration to the views of the Maldon residents, it would offer an opportunity to meet with the Committee to share in depth the proposals they had and to share the research already done, and an opportunity to work together with the committee to come to a resolution, or a way forward with the proposal. Instead the views of the Maldon people have been overruled and ignored which is a dictatorship of the council not a democracy for the people.

APPENDIX 2

- 7- There have been more deaths at the indoor swimming pool (Blackwater Leisure centre) than the 1 death that closed the lake. How can the council justify that centre to continue operating and remain open; and this is a lifeguarded facility where swimmers do not do so at their own risk? This is double standards of the council.

Regards

Lisa Cullumbine/Marie Ellis