

c/o Residents' Association of Canary Riverside  
Berkeley Tower  
48 Westferry Circus  
London E14 8RP

Our Ref: RH/RH/1453/

Date: 24 July 2018

Dear Sir/Madam,

**Canary Riverside Estate ('CRE')**

Thank you for your letter of 16 July 2018.

We wholly refute the accusation that our letter to leaseholders dated 29 June 2018 inappropriately promotes this firm such that it amounts to unsolicited touting for business. We have been retained on the basis of serious misgivings about the current stewardship of the Canary Riverside Estate. Those concerns have focussed on escalating legal costs which are likely to be met by CRE leaseholders through the annual service charge. What our letter canvasses is whether that concern is shared more widely. We do not, as you "suspect", act for the landlord or any landlord-owned companies.

As to assertions that you characterise as "misstatements", we would point out the following:

1. We accept that Mr Coates was appointed to replace Canary Riverside Estate Management. Your own publicity in March 2016 heralded the changeover from CREM and its appointed agent, Marathon, to Mr Alan Coates.
2. The headline costs budget figures outlined in our letter to leaseholders were canvassed in open court on 22 January 2018 in claim number D10CL312. We are not aware that they were subsequently refused by the Court, or that the claim has been stayed. This is not to discount your account of events. However, a stay differs markedly from the withdrawal of a claim. You can of course lay this to rest by indicating the basis on which the claim has been stayed?



Partners: I. D. Hay C. P. Murray R.S. Hammond  
Assistant Solicitors: K. Winster B. Fogarty J.Park Barrister: S. Taylor  
Assistant Conveyancer: L.F. Mansfield Consultants: G. Arovitolo R. Rooney  
This firm is authorised and regulated by The Solicitors Regulation Authority  
SRA Number 67042

3. We confirm we have not seen the parties' statements of case in the above matter. However, the claim appears to have been founded on an alleged ouster of CREM from parts of the Estate demised to it.

Finally, we would point out that we have been in correspondence with Mr Coates who has conspicuously refused to provide a substantive response to our letters. It was open to him to do so. He merely characterised as "opinion" our view of the escalating legal costs he appears to have incurred, or plans to incur. You may of course wish to assist by indicating whether information about the subject cases was ever disseminated by you (or a third party) to the leaseholders.

Yours faithfully



**MURRAY HAY**



Partners : I. D. Hay C. P. Murray R.S. Hammond  
Assistant Solicitors: K. Winster B. Fogarty

Assistant Conveyancers : L.F. Mansfield J.C. Prosser Consultants : G. Arovitolo R. Rooney  
This firm is authorised and regulated by The Solicitors Regulation Authority  
SRA Number 67042

 **resolution**  
first for family law

