

To: Garry Simmonette
Date: Mon, December 7, 2015 2:27 pm
CC: George Mansbridge; THV Admin for Circulation;
Emma Lewell-Buck MP; Stephen Hepburn MP
Cllr John Anglin; Cllr Audrey McMillan; Cllr John Wood
Unplanned Shed - ST/1146/13/COND
(Amended Planning Application – ST/0461/14/FUL.)

Dear Mr Simmonette,

In my email to you on Friday 4th Dec I assumed, possibly wrongly, that you would be familiar with the planning application ST/1146/13 submitted to meet the conditions of the grant of permission ST/0242/96 in 1996. This email is to give you some background but I wish first to dispel a common assumption held about drawing 8296/1A.
Drawing 8296/1A.

It has been assumed, wrongly, in recent correspondence I have had, that the section of the shed on this drawing is the landward end. It is the river end and there is no note to say that it, against standard drawing convention, is otherwise.
Background to ST/1146/13.

In October 2013 Local Residents (20 or so) met in the Littlehaven Hotel, South Shields, to discuss the Shed or Slipway Cover being constructed by UK Docks, nearby, in River Drive. The meeting agreed that the shed was built much higher than planned but this was difficult to prove because the plans provided by the Council could be interpreted to indicate that the height was not materially different from that planned and anyway the Council would not say how high the framework was. The the meeting decided to enlist the help of the Tyne Gateway Association.

About 30 Residents attended meeting of the Tyne Gateway Assn meeting on 9th November 2013 to which the ward Councillors were invited (Councillors Anglin and MacMillan attended, apologies were given for Councillor Wood).

To the view that the Shed was too high and in the wrong place,* it was added that it was too wide as well. Councillor Anglin said the meeting appeared to be confused about which end of the shed was planned to be 15.5m and that he would try and arrange for a meeting with the Council to clear this up. There is a gradient of nearly 3m between the ends of the shed and the shed is, by all accounts 3 meters too high.

A meeting was arranged on the 25th Nov 2013 with the Council. Three TGA Committee Members, along with two Councillors, Anglin and MacMillan, apologies were again given for Councillor Wood, attended as well. We were told that the shed was built to plan and that there was nothing we could do about it until the application to add another shed, slipway, rebuild the office block etc. was received.

The width of the shed was measured shortly after as it could be quite easily done by very simple surveying and was found to be a meter wider than planned. It took three more months before the Council admitted that the shed was also too high. Please see email from Mr Atkinson, 13th February 2014, he was the Planning Manager at that time. We were using drawing 8296/14 in our discussion as it did not have misleading errors.

Mr Mansbridge in his letter to Residents, in May 2014, defending his wish not to take

enforcement action used 8296/1A to justify his position. This is why I asked you in my email to take a fresh look both drawings and determine for yourself what you think the planned height should be.

It would appear that the shed should be dismantled or a retrospective planning application made for its continued use and that is what you should be addressing, not an application to extend it.

Yours sincerely
Michael Dawson

* it is believed that UK Docks were offered an alternative site by Port of Tyne: it is the extension of River Quay and the infill behind it that put an end to the slipway business in Tyne Dock after all.

PS who has taken over Mr Atkinson's responsibility in respect of complaints about planning decisions?