

FW: 2 St James' Place

From: "Hari Virk" <h.virk@btinternet.com>
To: <colin@bennett.uk.com>
Date: Sun, Nov 2, 2003, 7:14 PM
Subject: FW: 2 St James' Place

-----Original Message-----

From: Hari Virk [mailto:h.virk@btinternet.com]
Sent: 02 November 2003 18:07
To: Colin Bennett
Cc: hq@oss.org.uk; h.virk@btinternet.com
Subject: 2 St James' Place

Dear Mr Bennett

I am writing to express our disappointment at your refusal to come and visit and discuss your objection with us, despite having said that you were minded to come on Saturday, and giving the clear impression to Mark Harper that you wanted to resolve matters. I have only been seeking to engage in constructive dialogue with you.

It is only your objection, and that of Ms Ashbrook, which is holding up our gate. Ms Ashbrook tells me that she is acting under "advisement" from you and will withdraw her objection if you withdraw your's, an impression that she also conveyed to Steve Dryden.

I have spent the last month trying to get hold of you, via Ms Ashbrook, in order to discuss things with you. I understand Ms Ashbrook did nothing until last week, after a third telephone call by me, when I made it very clear to her that I was becoming anxious.

If you felt that I was rude to you, I have already apologised several times, even while feeling that you displayed hostility towards me during our telephone conversation. However, I do think that you are being disingenuous in using this as a reason not to meet us, or to seek any sort of compromise, as I am told by Steve Dryden that, even before I spoke to you, you had made it quite clear to Steve Dryden that would not change your position in any way. Moreover, I also understand that when you visited St James' Place on 17 September 2003 you met two of the residents, whom you have described as "courteous". Yet, you failed to reciprocate this courtesy by failing to declare your interest, even when you went onto private land owned by number 6. I also understand from one of the residents to whom you spoke that you were agitated by the gate outside no 6.

I will be writing separately to the Open Spaces Society, who I believe have behaved unreasonably, to make clear their representations, based wholly on your letter, are full of factual inaccuracies. I consider it irresponsible on their part to simply copy your representations, without carrying out any

12 St James' Place

kind of investigation themselves. Had they done so - and indeed had you done so - you would have realised that St James' Place has been a dead end for at least 30 years, and that there has never been a public right of way from St James' Place into Edwards Street. Where is the public interest, therefore, in having a right of way??

I would like to be sure you appreciate that, because of your lone objection, the resolution of this issue, will now have to be put off until it goes to Committee, in December. I say lone objection because, as you have yourself accepted, Ms Ashbrook will withdraw her objection if you withdraw yours.

I still hope that you will now engage with us in a constructive dialogue, prior to the Committee meeting. You have my email address if you wish to contact us, and other residents of St James' Place will be writing to you.

Yours sincerely

 Hari Virk