

17.5.1973



May 17, 1973

Mr Darrel Conybeare
PO Box 898
NORTH SYDNEY 2060

Dear Darrel :

We would like to give you the opportunity to reconsider your letter to us of May 11, 1973. It is possible that you wrote such a letter in haste. No letter of such petulance and silliness is worthy of a professional person. You have compounded your mistakes in judgement by attempting to involve Luna Park Holdings Limited by the act of sending them a copy of your letter. Luna Park simply want calm, sensible and effective service. They do not want and should not be bothered by petty and petulant squabbles between consultants.

We have to date been extraordinarily patient with your provocative and difficult behaviour over the past 12 months. For a long period we have put it down to your youthful lack of judgement and maturity and have confidently expected that given time you would grow out of it. However, now that you have published a slander against us you will, if you are not careful, force us to defend ourselves.

We have not failed to honour our agreements to pay you the fees as agreed over the last month or two for the colour schemes for Luna Park. This account we acknowledge to be due and payable. I have referred your request for settlement to our Accountant with a request that it be paid promptly.

Your petulance with us is unwise, in view of fully documented evidence in our possession of your and Neil Ingham's misbehaviour and unprofessional conduct during the latter months of your employment with USC. In October and November last year, a solicitor rang our switchboard and wrote our firm a letter instructing us to carry out certain work. This matter was referred to Neil Ingham as an employee of ours to handle. He carried out certain work and billed the client a fee for the work asking for payment to be made privately to him at his home address. In February this year, the client rang us and complained firstly, that the professional quality of the work was poor, that the

Page 2
Darrel Conybeare
May 17, 1973

charge was excessive and that he could not understand how he could receive an account from a private resident of Turrumurra when he had instructed our firm in writing to carry out the work.

Subsequently, during December 1972 and January 1973, while you and Neil Ingham remained employees of this firm, Mr Ingham was guilty of similar misconduct in that he billed another client from his home address for work done on a job for which USC was commissioned.

In the same period, letters were sent in the name of Mr Ingham and yourself to a number of our clients suggesting that they should engage you and your to-be-formed firm in our place. A number of clients referred these letters to us. In these actions you and/or Mr Ingham violated the Code of Professional Conduct of the Royal Australian Planning Institute to which you both belong. You violated clause 4 which states "A Member must not attempt to supplant another Member" and also clauses 5 and 6.

We have, to date, been too busy with our professional work in serving clients to have yet determined our precise course of action on the above matters. We would prefer to overlook them as mistakes of judgement on your part due to lack of experience and maturity. However, if you persist with intemperate letters and further slanders such as your letter to us of May 11, 1973, you will force us to reconsider that preference.

You should be well aware that we are bound by a contract signed in December 1972 between Urban Systems Corporation and the Adelaide City Council to establish in that city a city planning exhibition, meeting room and office under the title of "The City of Adelaide Planning Workshop". In view of this contractual obligation it was entirely proper for us to apply for the registration of that name in South Australia. This has been done.

We have no desire to confuse the public with overlapping names. We have previously assured you that we would now prefer not to use the title and that we are prepared to reconsider our use of that particular name in South Australia. This consideration is still proceeding, but is not assisted by your petulant behaviour.

Yours sincerely
URBAN SYSTEMS CORPORATION PTY LTD



George Clarke

c. c. Luna Park Holdings Ltd
Attention: Mr Rod Earle