

122

123 Therefore the Team decided to offer him two further dates in December 2016, and offered
124 to meet with him either in London or near to him. The final date was 12 December 2016.
125 The complainant told us that he had a long-standing commitment to a charity AGM on this
126 date. We therefore asked him when and where the AGM was taking place, and offered to
127 meet with him at that location, either before or after the AGM. If he felt he was not well
128 enough to attend a meeting, the Team offered the opportunity of a telephone conference
129 call. If he did not feel well enough for this, the Team sent him a short list of questions which
130 would have been explored with him at interview and invited him to respond briefly in
131 writing. There was no response to any of these options.

132

133 During the week immediately preceeding 12 December 2016, the complainant sent to the
134 Team three unsolicited bundles of documents (each over 20 pages long) relating to his
135 complaint. The team therefore believed that, as he was well enough to write, collate and
136 send these documents, he would have been well enough either to speak with us or to
137 answer our much briefer questions in writing.

138

139 The Team therefore concluded that it was not reasonably practicable to meet the
140 complainant face-to-face and decided to meet on 12 December 2016 in order to reach a
141 conclusion in these complaints.

142

143 **Vulnerable adults**

144

145 The Team also considered whether there were vulnerable adults associated with this
146 complaint but formed the view that initially none could be identified. A Vulnerable Adult is
147 any adult aged 18 or over who, by reason of mental or other disability, age, illness or other
148 situation is permanently or for the time being unable to take care of her or himself, or to
149 protect her or himself from significant harm or exploitation.

150

151 At the conclusion of its investigation the Team asked the same question about vulnerable
152 adults. In its view none could be identified.

153

154 **District Complaints Support Group**

155

156 The lead member contacted the Convenor of the District Complaints Support Group,
157 providing sufficient information for support to be offered to the parties.

158

159 **Local Complaints Officer**

160

161 The Rev Dr David M Chapman was the local complaints officer. After investigation, he
162 concluded that it was neither in the interest of natural justice nor proportionate to the
163 matters in dispute to refer the complaints to a connexional complaints team.