

Response to the Suspensions in Rushcliffe CLP

September 2015 – June 2018

**Addendum 1 - Response to Additional Materials
presented in January 2018**

Peter Gates

*West Bridgford Branch Labour Party
Rushcliffe Constituency Labour Party*

*"This above all - to thine own self be true,
And it must follow, as the night the day,
Thou canst not then be false to any man."*

Polonius, Hamlet, Act 1 Scene 3

Section E: Additional Materials

29. Additional Allegations

Since my Response was submitted in November 2017, and after the cancellations of the hearing on 4th December 2017, I was provided with three further documents: Statement by Sandra Coker, Complaints Cover Letter, and Email to John Walsh. These are presumably in response to my submission, and the only reply to our request for the Presenter to provide some concrete evidence on the allegations in the Charges Pack. These three documents raise very serious issues over the integrity of the allegations made against me.

In my personal and long professional life of 42 years, I have always treated people with respect and courtesy. I expect no less of the way I should be treated by the Labour Party. Instead I find myself treated with utter contempt as if I were a common criminal – rather than a committed Party member of 25 years standing.

29.1. Document 1 Additional Statement by Sandra Coker.

This document is provided on the next page. I find it rather strange, since I have never subjected anyone, Sandra Coker in particular, to harassment and intimidation. Nor have I “*bombarded*” her with emails. I do not know to what Sandra is referring with “*aggressive representations at meetings and having my views and actions misrepresented to others*” at all. In spite of making a request for evidence from the Presenter, I have been provided with no examples of this totally unsubstantiated set of allegations. It would be easy to provide evidence – for example the emails and minutes of meetings - yet none is forthcoming. It surely cannot be acceptable that complainants make prejudicial assertions that are not backed up with any evidence.

I have already in my Response identified the positive qualities that Sandra has, and I am not aware of having made any derogatory remarks, and no-one has been able to identify any to me. I proposed a vote of thanks to Sandra when she stood down as CLP Chair, and would proudly do so again. We have missed her enthusiasm and dedication.

However there is a further more serious claim by Sandra Coker in this document - that in both Rushcliffe CLP and West Bridgford BLP: “*anyone who is not an active ‘momentum’ supporter is branded ‘right wing’, side-lined, excluded from groups and/or actively encouraged to leave the branch/CLP.*” This is a serious allegation against, not only me but also the current democratically elected leadership of both the CLP and BLP. I believe this needs to be presented to both Chairs of the CLP and BLP in order for them to present this to their respective Executive Committees and consider a response. It suggests to me there is some underlying political motivation behind the coordinated allegations made – something I just do not understand. I am sure a lot of members will be quite insulted by the suggestion that they have been “*enlisted*” to support my cause – whatever that is. To be allowed to introduce such serious allegations against a CLP and BLP is quite inappropriate for a just and impartial hearing. I do admit to supporting the cause of electing a Labour Government as soon as possible, and do encourage members and voters to sign up to that.

I notice that Sandra says she resigned in December 2015, yet, as I have argued in my Response she was in attendance at the 7th March 2016 meeting of Rushcliffe EC.

I am afraid I am at a loss to understand the motivation behind this Additional Statement.

Peter Gates Disciplinary Hearing

I have neither the time nor the appetite for raking over unpleasant details of events that took place two years ago. I am not attending this hearing in person as I choose to avoid contact with Peter Gates who continues to attempt to manipulate all situations to his own advantage. I have withdrawn from all active involvement with the Labour Party in West Bridgford and Rushcliffe CLP, including the Women's Forum, since I resigned as Rushcliffe CLP chair in December 2015.

In the short space of time (September to December 2015) that my position as chair of Rushcliffe CLP coincided with Peter Gates's position as secretary, I was subjected to behaviour from Peter Gates which was nothing short of harassment and intimidation. It included being bombarded with emails, aggressive representations at meetings and having my views, personality and actions misrepresented to others that he enlisted to support his cause.

My experience of West Bridgford branch and Rushcliffe CLP, where widely differing opinions and viewpoints were openly shared, discussed and respected, has changed under Peter Gates influence (which persists although he has been suspended from the party for some time) to one where anyone who is not an active 'momentum' supporter is branded 'right wing', side-lined, excluded from groups and/or actively encouraged to leave the branch/CLP.

I will continue to refrain from active involvement in West Bridgford Branch and Rushcliffe CLP while Peter Gates continues to be allowed to dominate and set the agenda.

Sandy Coker 30/11/17

29.2. Document 2 – Complaints cover Letter.

This document relates to the minutes of the 7th March 2016 meeting. The issue here is that the integrity of a key document (the minutes of the 7th March 2016 CLP Meeting leading to the suspension of 10 Party members), appears to have been compromised, presumably by one of the complainants. This cover letter appears to have been written by a Richard Oliver, who is someone who has had no involvement in this matter up until now. He is not involved at all in Rushcliffe CLP. This letter appears to contain some incongruous comments which seem to be at odds with Labour Party procedures. There is also a very direct criticism of the Rushcliffe CLP which I feel needs to be drawn to the attention of the Chair of the CLP to present to the CLP Executive Committee for a response. In this document Richard Oliver makes claims and assertions without any evidence, yet he seemingly does so on behalf of the NEC. Worryingly, the comments he makes suggest he has not actually read the documentation to which he is referring and which contradicts his comments in several places. I will go through the document.

First, I have not "*pursued a complaint against Elizabeth Edgerton*", indeed the two letters Richard provides do clearly show that. In my first letter I cite no one by name, merely pointing out the incongruous existence of contrasting minutes:

The basis of my complaint therefore is that I think there has been a serious breach of procedures here, which needs to be investigated by the appropriate body.

In the reply from the Chair of the CLP, I was specifically asked for a response to two questions as required by the Labour Party procedures:

- Who is your complaint about?
- What action are you asking to be taken?"

My reply was:

In my complaint, I did not want to identify any one person as culpable; it is not my way to make complaints about Party members behind their backs. I personally prefer a more comradely approach to politics. However, given the circumstances, and the seriousness of this matter I feel I have no alternative but to follow the Party Rule book, as I outlined in my original letter. This construction of two sets of minutes appeared to be part of the management of the CLP and I felt it more appropriate that the CLP itself apportioned responsibility. However, I take your point about the nature of a complaint.

I then had no choice but to point to who had the ultimate responsibility for producing and distributing minutes – the CLP Secretary:

Given that my complaint relates to the construction of EC minutes, this has to be therefore part of the remit of the CLP Secretary at the time, Elizabeth Edgerton. From the evidence that I have been provided with, it would appear that Mrs Edgerton has produced two widely different sets of minutes and distributed the two versions to two different sets of people – the EC and Party members. One set of these minutes - the shorter version – seriously misrepresents the events at the EC meeting, whilst the other more detailed set, appears to be largely accurate. This seems inexplicable, but does not seem to have been brought to the attention of the EC, the GC or indeed the East Midlands Regional Office. This would appear therefore to warrant disciplinary action.

The CLP EC and CLP GC took a similar view, and voted quite overwhelmingly to instigate an investigation, which it is quite at liberty so to do. I am genuinely surprised that there is no recognition and acceptance by Richard Oliver that there are indeed two contrasting sets of minutes. Somehow, I became a villain for pointing that out – something that was bought to my attention by a member of the EC.

One further issue is that one version of the minutes of the **7th March 2016** meeting were presented to the CLP EC on **4th April 2016**. There was a long discussion and much disagreement over the accuracy of the minutes presented to the EC, which takes up three pages, such that a vote had to be taken on amendments, one of which fell by 4 votes to 3. In my 42-year career, including attendance at a multitude of meetings in very diverse contexts, I have *never* had a situation where approval of the minutes went to such a vote, that wasn't unanimous. I presume the four here were the four complainants. To quote Winston Churchill, history is written by the victors.

Richard Oliver claims I complained that Mrs Edgerton had "*fallen short of her obligations to take accurate minutes of meetings when in her role as Secretary of the CLP*". This is not the case; the minutes of the 7th March meeting in the Charges Pack are particularly accurate, so much so I am astonished anyone can take down such detail without a recording. I certainly couldn't.

Richard Oliver further claims: "*specifically the excessive and punitive use of legitimate Labour Party structures and processes.*" This is not a charge that is included in the Charge Sheet contained in the Charges Pack and again there is no information on either the "*excessive*" and the "*punitive*" uses of Labour Party "*structures and processes*" to which Richard Oliver is referring; this is just untrue. But, is the NEC claiming that adherence to Labour Party Rules and procedures is against Labour Party Rules and thus a disciplinary offence?

Richard Oliver claims that such a complaint is "*inappropriate*". I am afraid I cannot see how, what has every appearance of deception, can be in any way countenanced. I do not know why there are two sets of minutes, nor does the CLP; hence an investigation appears quite appropriate which is why the CLP GC voted 27-9 to approve it.

Furthermore, this is claimed to be "*a continued pattern of behaviour*" on my part. I am totally unaware of what this behaviour is and Richard Oliver provides no evidence. I presume it might be "*the excessive and punitive use of legitimate Labour Party procedures*" and "*the use of legitimate party processes in excess to intimidate and undermine.*" Again, no examples of such usage are offered and none are apparent in any record of meetings in Rushcliffe CLP and West Bridgford BLP. I indicated in my Response that I felt some had been misled into believing things they were told, but which ultimately had no truth in reality. This feels like another example of that.

Richard Oliver claims I left it until March 2017 to raise this matter. This was simply because no one had noticed the two sets of minutes until then, because they were distributed to two separate groups of people. This remained the case until one EC member lost their laptop and asked a member for the minutes.

Richard complains about the raising of the issue:

suspended members raising a local complaint, the content of which is already being considered by a live NCC case is inappropriate.

I would have thought the production of two sets of minutes was highly inappropriate personally; the CLP would have been quite within its rights to reject the investigation; it did not do so. Richard Oliver goes on:

A simultaneous investigation against a witness in this NCC hearing would undoubtedly jeopardise its integrity and arguably provide additional support to the Respondent.

Well, this is the issue. The existence of two sets of minutes casts doubt on the integrity of one of the complainants and indeed part of the evidence on which one of the Charges rests. This is surely something the NCC would want to be made aware of if a hearing is to be fair and transparent. I can well understand why Richard Oliver would want to suppress this matter. But to argue that bringing this to the attention of the CLP and the NCC is hardly “*excessive and punitive use of legitimate Labour Party procedures*”.

Finally, what is more unusual here is that a CLP has democratically and appropriately followed the Labour Party Rule book (**Chapter 6, Clause II,1, A-M**), has discussed a complaint and decided by a very large majority, that it warrants a formal CLP investigation. Richard Oliver, completely overlooks the possible wrong-doing in producing contrasting sets of minutes - one of which presents an inaccurate account of a meeting - and makes allegations against someone making a legitimate complaint that adheres to the Labour Party Rulebook. This again is quite breathtakingly improper. Subsequently the current Regional Director appears to have instructed the CLP Chair to stop the investigation into the alleged malpractice - because it might suggest I was breaking the conditions of my suspension. Another breath-taking and crass attempt at interfering in the legitimate Party processes by Regional Officials.

My inquiry about the progress of this matter received a response from the CLP Chair which suggests there is an attempt by East Midlands Regional Officers to quash discussion of the matter - the very same Regional Officers involved in liaising with the complainants back in January 2016. I gather the CLP Chair (a very well respected long-standing member and local councillor) was threatened by the Regional Director, with disciplinary action for bringing the Party into disrepute if he allowed the CLP GC to discuss what they had democratically and within Party Rules agreed by a large majority. I understand that the current CLP Secretary (a very competent professional woman and Professor of Physics) was so insulted by the tone of the correspondence she received from the Regional Director, she threatened to resign.

A final comment from Richard Oliver relates to the make-up of the panel to investigate the matter - “*an all-male panel*”. I am reading this as rather more than a description or observation, but a criticism. I am not sure Richard Oliver is aware that the CLP Chair had requested permission of the East Midlands Regional Office to appoint members of this Panel from outside the EC in order to have women on the panel. This was refused.

Complaints pursued against Elizabeth Edgerton by Peter Gates

Since suspension, Peter Gates has pursued a complaint against Elizabeth Edgerton within the CLP structures, specifically attempting to get Rushcliffe CLP to undertake a local investigation into the conduct of Elizabeth Edgerton.

These complaints were that she had fallen short of her obligations to take accurate minutes of meetings when in her role as Secretary of the CLP.

These complaints are inappropriate and demonstrate a continued pattern of behaviour on the part of the Respondent since suspension.

Note:

- Peter Gate's complaints are in regards to Elizabeth Edgerton's minuting of the special meeting held on 7th March 2016.
- She has not been CLP Secretary since October 2016.
- Peter Gates did not raise a complaint regarding her conduct as Secretary until the end of March 2017, nearly a year after the meeting and five months after she stepped down as CLP Secretary.
- There are other inconsistencies in the dates referenced in the enclosed documents, namely the highlighted dates
- The CLP Secretary and Chair were asked for all documentation relating to this by the East Midlands Labour Party Regional Office, as of yet they have not provided this.
- The complaints made by Elizabeth Edgerton and others are in regards to bullying and intimidation on the part of the Respondent, specifically the excessive and punitive use of legitimate Labour Party structures and processes.
- A simultaneous local investigation against a witness in this NCC hearing would undoubtedly jeopardise its integrity and arguably provide additional support to the Respondent.
- Suspended members raising a local complaint, the content of which is already being considered by a live NCC case is inappropriate.

This behaviour shows a continued pattern of behaviours on the part of Peter Gates since suspension, specifically the use of legitimate party process in excess to intimidate and undermine others.

Please the enclosed documents

-
- 1 – Peter Gates' complaints (30/3/17) against Elizabeth Edgerton
 - 2 – Letter from CLP Chair seeking clarity from Peter Gates on the complaint (16/3/17)
 - 3 – Peter Gates' response to this letter (12/5/17)

The CLP had opted to pursue a local investigation into this matter but have been asked to suspend the investigation until completion of the NCC hearing. They had assembled an all-male panel to interview Elizabeth Edgerton and put Peter's complaints to her.

Regards.

Richard Oliver

Peter Gates
10 Belfry Way
Edwalton
Nottingham
NG12 4FA

Thursday, 30th March 2017

Dear Jean, Keir and Alistair,

Suspensions in Rushcliffe

I am writing to you as officers of the Rushcliffe Labour Party EC to lodge a formal complaint over what appears to be deliberate distortion of minutes of a local Rushcliffe Labour Party meeting – distortion which I believe has led to my suspension from the party. I do not know who to take this to, as the formal procedures are not transparent, but I hope as CLP Officers you can deal with my complaint appropriately. Allow me to expand.

On 7th March, 2016, along with several officers within Rushcliffe CLP, I attended a meeting that had been described by Finbar Bowie, the East Midlands Regional Officer, as “a meeting of Rushcliffe CLP”. I had received an email specifically inviting me to attend this meeting which was set up to discuss “recent complaints and the situation in generally in Rushcliffe”. It was not stated why I had been invited, nor whether anyone else had received similar invites. I brought this meeting to the attention of a number of new GC delegates, and 8 attended. Prior to this meeting I had not been told anything about why the meeting was called, nor why I had been specifically invited. In order to clarify the purpose of the meeting Finbar Bowie assured me the week before that he would arrange for Andy Furlong to ring me before 7th March to explain what the meeting was about. This never happened. I also informed Finbar Bowie that I was happy to go to Leicester, or wherever else was convenient, to talk to Andy Furlong before the 7th March meeting. No response was received to that offer. That 7th March meeting ended in a fiasco and along with the 10 officers I received a letter of Administrative Suspension on 11th March 2016. I have not been informed that my suspension has anything to do with that event, this is mere speculation on my part. I have now been suspended since 11th March 2016. I have not been informed why, nor do I know when the case will be investigated. This seems to be a total abnegation of any system of natural justice and seems to be contrary to both Labour Party Rules and the recommendations of the Chakrabarti Report.

However, it has recently been brought to my attention that there were two quite different sets of minutes produced for the EC Meeting of 7th March 2016; one set sent to West Bridgford Branch members (Eve Cina, Linda Burdett and Zbyszek Luczynski) by the CLP Secretary and another set presented to the CLP EC on 4th April. I have appended both sets of minutes to this letter.

The first set of minutes, on the left, appears to be a fairly accurate account of events, though there are some inaccuracies. For example, neither set of minutes includes the attendance of the husband of the CLP secretary as an observer. On the basis of those minutes I can see no justification for any suspension.

The second set of minutes, on the right, not only omits crucial details of what took place on that evening, but also seriously misrepresents the events. It is possible these second, inaccurate, minutes were used to suspend the 10 Officers including myself if these have been believed by officers of the Party. This is not only an injustice, but I would suggest is a significant offence. The two sets of minutes are very different, omit a request by an EC member to allow the observers to attend, but most significantly replaces three pages of detail, which includes my call for unity and offer to leave, with:

“The two invited members were asked to come into the room. Eight others who had not been invited also came in. They were asked to leave twice by the Chair and twice by the representative of the Regional Board. There were expressions of dissent from some of those who had not been invited, and as they did not leave the meeting it was adjourned by the Chair on the advice of Andy Furlong”

This is quite an inaccurate distortion of events which is contradicted on the other set of minutes. I would like to point out four issues:

- I was personally invited to the March 7th meeting;
- Prior to 7th March all CLP meetings had been open to observers, and two of the 10 had been specifically told by a previous CLP Secretary - Steve Calvert – they could attend.
- We were told by the Chair of the Regional Board that the meeting was "*not a disciplinary hearing*";
- At that meeting (as shown in the first set of minutes) I called for unity and offered to leave.

The basis of my complaint therefore is that I think there has been a serious breach of procedures here, which needs to be investigated by the appropriate body. I have also attached a brief chronology of events which I believe illustrates serious shortcomings in this process.

I would be grateful if you might look into the appropriate procedures to follow here, and take whatever action is called for in the Party Rules and procedures, as I do believe this is bringing the local Party into disrepute, is quite unjust and needs resolving.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Regards

Peter Gates

Keir Chewings

Chairman of Rushcliffe Constituency Labour Party

163 Ringleas, Cotgrave, Nottingham NG12 3PQ
Tel: 0115 9893110 Mob: 07557528255
Email: kechewings@me.com

Date: 16/03/2017

Peter Gates

10 Belfry Way
Edwalton
Nottingham
NG12 4FA

REF: SUSSPENSIONS IN RUSHCLIFFE

Dear Peter:

Thank you for your correspondence dated the 23rd June 2017. I replied to you at the time confirming receipt of your formal complaint and that it would be discussed at Rushcliffe CLP Exec meeting on Monday 3rd July 2017 in line with the Labour party rule book.

Your written complaint was considered as to whether it met the threshold to refer to the next GC meeting for consideration to undertake an investigation. However there were queries raised about your complaint that need to be answered to allow us to follow the due process.

Could you please clarify the following:

Who is your complaint about?

What action are you asking to be taken?

If you could please respond to this letter and clarify these points I will ensure that your complaint is listed at the next executive meeting.

Also detailed in your letter was the amount of time that you have been suspended from the party with out a hearing or a date for a hearing. I would like to take this opportunity to express my extreme disappointment and sadness that you and John Walsh has been subjected to suspension for this time with out any apparent progress in the situation. The amount of time that has passed, is in my view unacceptable and needs to be addressed. For this reason I will be writing to the chair of the NCC, Ian McNichol and the leader of the Labour party Jeremy Corbyn to:

Express my extreme disappointment that 2 members of Rushcliffe CLP have been suspended for this length of time with out further progress on the investigation.

Ask exactly what you have been accused of and ask that you are informed, to allow you the opportunity to gather supportive documents or evidence that may be relevant to the case in a timely manor to prevent loss or destruction.

Why has your suspension and investigation taken so long?

I will CC you and John Walsh as well as the members of the exec into this letter to ensure full transparency.

If you have any queries on this or any other matter please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Keir Chewings". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial "K".

Keir Chewings

Chairman of Rushcliffe Constituency Labour Party

Peter Gates
10 Belfry Way
Edwalton
Nottingham
NG12 4FA

Thursday, 12th May 2017

Dear Keir,

Complaint to Rushcliffe CLP over possible misconduct

Thank you for your letter regarding the complaint I made to my Branch and to the CLP.

As you can see it relates to a possible case of serious misconduct over the management of Rushcliffe CLP insofar as two very different sets of minutes were presented to Party members and to EC members for a meeting on 7th March 2016 that was described as *"a meeting of Rushcliffe CLP"* by the East Midlands Regional Officer, Finbar Bowies, but which turned out to be a meeting of Rushcliffe CLP EC. This would not normally be significant where differences were largely minor or typographical. However, the differences in the two sets of minutes are so significant and striking that one set totally misrepresents the meeting. Since this EC meeting led to the suspension of 10 members, causing considerable division within the CLP, this difference has a material relevance especially if the minutes were deliberately altered to that effect.

In my complaint, I did not want to identify any one person as culpable; it is not my way to make complaints about Party members behind their backs. I personally prefer a more comradely approach to politics. However, given the circumstances, and the seriousness of this matter I feel I have no alternative but to follow the Party Rule book, as I outlined in my original letter. This construction of two sets of minutes appeared to be part of the management of the CLP and I felt it more appropriate that the CLP itself apportioned responsibility. However, I take your point about the nature of a complaint.

Given that my complaint relates to the construction of EC minutes, this has to be therefore part of the remit of the CLP Secretary at the time, Elizabeth Edgerton. From the evidence that I have been provided with, it would appear that Mrs Edgerton has produced two widely different sets of minutes and distributed the two versions to two different sets of people – the EC and Party members. One set of these minutes - the shorter version – seriously misrepresents the events at the EC meeting, whilst the other more detailed set, appears to be largely accurate. This seems inexplicable, but does not seem to have been brought to the attention of the EC, the GC or indeed the East Midlands Regional Office. This would appear therefore to warrant disciplinary action.

My apologies for only bringing this now, but we only discovered this by accident quite recently, when a member of the EC asked a Party member if they had a set of the minutes, because their laptop had crashed, only to find the version they were given was very different from those they remembered. This caused some members of the EC to compare the documents they had with the set that had been given to Party members.

Thank you again for raising this.

Regards

Peter Gates

29.3. Document 3 – Email to John Walsh

This document is quite worrying. This document appears to have come out of the blue, and is referenced nowhere. It purports to be an email from me – highlighting a phrase I am supposed to have written – from a private exchange with another member. My first question here is how this was come by. I have no recollection of sending this email and a thorough search of my email records can find no trace of it nor of any of the phrases within it. It is very suspicious that it comes on a pdf, without any the headers that allows an email to be traced, and with so many punctuation and grammatical errors it looks more like a primary school attempt than something written by someone who makes his living as an academic author. I have requested the originals from Richard Oliver, but this has been declined. My solicitor requested the original from the Labour Party Solicitor, who refused. I can only conclude they do not have the original because it does not exist.

If this was part of action within a court of law, I believe we could well have a case for potentially perverting the course of justice. If it is fabricated, I know not by whom, though I have my suspicions; potentially by whomsoever fabricated the anonymous letters that appear in the Charges Pack, about which I know nothing and whose production and distribution I had nothing to do with. Without access to the original and demonstrable proof that the email is genuine, we have a potential case of fabrication of evidence.

On the next page is the purported email exchange. I have the actual email exchange in full. They are quite different – and I can provide access to the originals for the panel.

From: peter.gates3@btopenworld.com [mailto:peter.gates3@btopenworld.com]
Sent: 22 January 2016 10:10
To: john.walsh@designforpurpose.co.uk
Subject: Re: EM Momentum letter to Trade Unions, EM Momentum letter to CLPs and LP Branches

lots to do eh.

I think however I will still flag up educational policy for a debate at GC.

Kate is great! interestingly a Rushcliffe lovely person had to go to Broxtowe to get elected.

The anti new member is a solid position we have to counter - and it will go on..it is the defining issue in labour. which is why we have to keep pushing. **Look we have ousted Sandy and Liz! We are getting people on GC etc. and making life difficult. WE are ploughing on in only a few months.**

Peter Gates
10 Belfry Way
Edwalton
Nottingham
NG12 4FA

From: john.walsh@designforpurpose.co.uk
Sent: Friday, 22 January 2016 10:04
To: PETER GATES

The conversation was at a Keyworth executive meeting. I don;t think it would help to try and alter opinions by doing good things (e.g. sound education policy). It's part of a narrative - yet another dimension to the anti new member position. R argued that there are more important, wider issues than the local parish council agenda that dominates Branch meetings - the reply was that as she lived in a 600k house (cheeky gits, it's more than that) she doesn't understand the lives of the poor folk of Keyworth.

The narrative is about us having self-interests which are the main reason for engaging with new members. This is a bit of a shock and will be very difficult to counter. It's not only a Keyworth 'small-minded' thing, it's also a Rushcliffe thing. Lots of wealthy people and lots more than average frustrated, under-achieving, not going anywhere people. If you've achieved more than most, you must have been bad to get there.

Difficult to get across in email - am I making sense at all?

According to KK folklore, Kate Foales is also a bad person - something to do with Branch boundaries and a shouting match involving the lovely Finbar.

> On 22 January 2016 at 09:44 PETER GATES <peter.gates3@btopenworld.com> wrote:
>