
From: Will Friend <friend.northdown@btinternet.com>
Sent: 22 September 2010 09:00
To: Robert Owen
Cc: Harvey Patterson; TDC
Subject: Settlement between P.Miles and TDC, and between P.Miles and W. Friend.
Attachments: Gazette 13.11.09.JPG; Gazette 18.12.2009.JPG; Berryrnans Lace Mawer 06 10.tif; H of T for JS with amendments 28.07.10.doc; Heads of Terms 05 10.tif; Heads of Terms 05 10 plan.tif

c.c. The Monitoring Officer.,TDC
Robert Owen Solicitor for P.Miles, Robinson and Alfree.

Dear Mr.Owen,
Please find the e-mail below from your client, P.Miles, forwarded by Mr.Squier.

I am forwarding under separate cover copies of evidence and a statement I have provided to the coach house working party.at TDC.
The evidence includes.

The Coach House

Statement of my position on the need for the coach house to be used for uses ancillary to the park as a public open space in accordance with the covenants put in place by my grandfather .

Letter to the chief executive from me in 2006 about your clients campaign of allegations against me of twenty five years.

Letter to the monitoring officer about Cllr. Wise's intervention in this campaign on your clients behalf.

List of council nominations for the cliftonville ward seats for the May 2007 elections .

Recommendations in 2008 for the 'disposal' of properties in Northdown Park, including the Coach House, by Cllr Ezekiel as head of the council, and Cllr Wise as head of finance.

Letter from the local authority ombudsman recommending referral of these councillors to the Standards Board.

Report by Local Authority detailing the breaches of your clients lease of the coach house, and lack of repair of it.

I fail to see how any of these letters can be viewed as 'defamatory' as your client claims, as they are all rooted in fact and are on the public record.

If your client has evidence to show that any of this evidence is untrue or not rooted in fact he should provide his supporting evidence to the scrutiny hearing as I have been invited to do.

The reason I have circulated correspondence on this matter so widely is that your clients actions and allegations have affected so many people, due to the way that your client has tried to use public resources to fight his battles for him over so many years, making so many allegations against so many people to so many public bodies.

Attempts at settlement of all the issues between your client and myself , and if possible between your client and all other parties.

Coach House

I genuinely believe that your client no longer has any realistic hope of acquiring and developing the coach house for apartments or any other such use as he hoped over the ;last 25 years, and that if any realistic chance of an overall settlement is to be reached, your client should recognize this. 2000 people, most of whom are legally 'beneficiaries of the covenants' on Northdown Park have signed a petition calling for the dropping of the asset disposal proposals and for the implementation of the covenants , so that the buildings are 'maintained for ever' by the 'Margate Borough' as a 'public park',(with the building used for ancillary purposes. This is not, therefore a personal matter between your client and myself, but, because of your clients past actions a matter of public concern. Mr. Squire is not instructed in these matters so please advise your client not to refer his concerns on these matter to him , but to the TDC monitoring officer.

Orchard

I have instructed James Squire as a senior chartered Surveyor , and negotiator to try and reach settlement with your client over all the issues between us, The ownership of the orchard, the road, the harassment and allegations made by your client and so forth.

On the 15th March 2010 your client undertook to enter into a mediation process. He however cancelled the hearing set for June, and failed to agree a re-scheduling. You probably have not been shown the two offers we have made to settle these matters which I attach hereto for your information.

1/ The first offer was made in April/May, without the benefit of a prior face to face meeting as this too was cancelled by your client. The offer was to sell the orchard for a token fee of £30,000 , and to grant your client all necessary easements and rights of way to serve new development of the land , and for me to write off all costs incurred.

2/ Your client responded by issuing a further long list of allegations against me in a solicitors letter. These allegations being largely the same as those investigated and determined, by the local authority's independent review, on the one hand and those issues relating to the ownership and management of the road , which are currently subject to a 1st registration application before the land registry adjudicator.

A meeting was finally held between Mr. Squire and your client designed , once again , to bring all these matters to a close. Determining the first registration of the road, transferring the orchard title to your client , registration and rectification of all rights and easements, a workable road management regime and an undertaking by your client to cease his allegations against my use of the road, nursery or business units.

Your client chose instead to press on with his high court action against my 3 surviving elderly aunts.

We have unilaterally withdrawn from the orchard case , and the offer to settle the remaining issues is still on the table. Mr. Squire has asked your client for a further meeting to look again at our proposals. We are prepared to grant your client the easements and access rights he needs to develop his property further, and to make the necessary investment in the land on my side of the road , to develop this land in sympathy with the character of the lane, for the benefit of all parties. From your clients point of view, however, it is hard to see how officers will take a sympathetic view on undertaking review of the planning policies of the area , whilst your client is still locked in dispute with them over the coach house. In view of this , we now feel that we had best try to conclude this dispute as far as possible in a step by step fashion, and Mr. Hall will be writing to you in due course on how to move the process forward in this fashion.

yours sincerely

William Friend.

>>> Peter Miles <prmile@hotmail.co.uk> 21/09/10 13:26 >>>

Dear James,

Without Prejudice

I trust you had a good break, welcome back.

We agreed to talk on your return and I recall you were going to read through the recently disclosed defamatory correspondence which to confirm, is dated 6th May 2009, 2nd May 2009, 25th January 2010, 23rd April 2010, 31st May 2010. To my certain knowledge, these various communications including letters to the Press, were published to a great many individuals, including Members and senior Officers of Thanet District Council, the Local Government Ombudsman, Roger Gale MP, all conservative Councillors, the Leader of the Labour Group on Thanet District Council, and with regards 'The Coach House, Northdown Park, all members of the asset Management Working Group . The above are in addition to other defamatory correspondence and blog entries which have been published in recent years, together with the defamatory correspondence sent to my neighbours.

You stated that you couldn't understand why William and Louise had become involved with the Coach House, however when you have read the above it may become clearer. I have attached two articles published in the local Press, showing a photograph of Louise and my neighbour, Mr Riordan campaigning outside of the building. If you care to visit the TDC Web site, on the first page under the heading Focus on Thanet, there is reference to a Coach House Working Party, which has resulted from the above campaigning - another rather large can of worms I am sorry to say.

Notwithstanding all of the above however, I must confirm to you, as I stated during our last telephone conversation, I have absolutely no doubt that when you stated there was no other correspondence, you were totally and honestly unaware of any of the above.

Can you confirm when you have had the opportunity of reading the above and I will then telephone you. If we are going to reach any sort of agreement, we still need to address the outstanding issues however including the result of the huge damage that has been caused by the prolific defamatory correspondence which William has published.

Regards,

Peter Miles

DISCLAIMER:

This message is private and confidential. Any sharing of this message or its contents is prohibited unless approved by Bidwells LLP. If you have received this message in error, please notify the sender and destroy the message and any attachments.

This email is sent on behalf of Bidwells LLP, a limited liability partnership trading as Bidwells. Bidwells LLP is a corporate body owned by its members.

Where used the term 'Partner' refers to one of the members or an employee who is a senior professional. The use of this term does not imply that Bidwells LLP is a general partnership under the Partnership Act 1890.

Bidwells LLP is registered in England & Wales (registered number OC344553). Registered head office is Bidwell House, Trumpington Road, Cambridge CB2 9LD, where a list of members is available for inspection.

Bidwells LLP reserves the right to monitor all communications through its internal and external networks. Whilst all effort is made to safe guard emails and attachments through virus checking, we advise you to carry out your own checks. Bidwells LLP do not accept liability for any loss or damage caused by software virus.

Before you print, please think of the environment.
