

31/10/2018 3:18pm

Hi R.H.

Thank you for sending us those documents.

I think it's clear from Reeds Rains' response that they are desperately clutching at straws here.

They reference the fact that I have not provided evidence of not being informed of the planning permission, yet exactly how am I supposed to prove a negative here? Are they expecting me to produce an email where they state "Please note that we are NOT telling you about the planning permission on that field."?! Or perhaps I am supposed to reference a telephone call that did not take place?! The whole notion is frankly ridiculous.

If Reeds Rains had informed us of this planning permission like they claim to have done, then they would have evidence of it. The fact that they have evidence of having informed other parties and not of informing us is NOT a coincidence - it is clearly because they did not inform us and it is impossible to have evidence of an event that did not occur.

It is also ridiculous that Reeds Rains would claim that the office is able to recall informing other parties of the planning permission and yet cannot recall whether we were informed or not, yet the motivation for this comical scenario is crystal clear: they cannot insist that we *were* informed because that would be a lie, and yet they do not wish to admit that we *weren't* informed because that leaves them liable. So instead they claim to be the victims of convenient selective amnesia. Politicians

like to use this trick as well, and it's as transparent in their case as it is here. Please do not fall for such nonsense.

Secondly, I see that they are attempting to convince you of the same equally ridiculous claim that they tried to convince us of: that evidence that they informed other parties of the planning is somehow evidence that they informed us, like we are all connected via a psychic link and information given to one individual is magically shared with everyone else. This is simply not the case, and whether or not they shared the information with other parties (parties who ended up not purchasing the property I might add!) is completely irrelevant: the simple fact is that they did not share it with US, and as a result we went ahead and purchased the property.

The Consumer Protection from Unfair Trading Regulations 2008 means that each and every party that viewed the property should have been informed of this planning permission - not 1/3 or 2/3 of those parties. The fact that we were not informed is therefore a clear violation of those regulations and as such Reeds Rains should face up to their responsibilities and compensate us for any losses incurred.

I ask you to please not be taken in by Reeds Rains' frankly laughable attempts at dodging their responsibilities here and to hold them accountable.

Kind regards