

From: mick.dawson@theharbourview.co.uk
Sent: 05 September 2014 12:27
To: Customer Advocates
Cc: George Mansbridge
Subject: Addn II: 253539 - Stage 3 complaint escalation

Dear Michael Hamilton,

Sorry to write to you again about the Slipway Shed on River Drive but to my mind there are still some outstanding issues. On April 4th I wrote to Mr Mansbridge about the slipway shed on River Drive and his response was to request Leanne Bootes to raise the complaint -248789 - Stage 1 complaint regarding Tyne Slipway building. He did not reply to me.

We have moved on since but there are three questions raised in my letter to him that still need looking at that were not addressed by Mr Mansbridge when he 'hid' behind the complaints system.

- 1) The council has not provided a response to our request that work on or in the shed be stopped until the planning issues have been resolved (please see emails to/from Gordon Atkinson below).
- 2) The council have allowed the use of the shed when it has not been built to plan.
- 3) That making of the UK Docks slipway off Commercial Road redundant by the expansion plans by the Port of Tyne was not properly addressed by the planning office when allowing the redevelopment of the slipway on River Drive.

I will try and put point 3 more clearly. The council went to the trouble of getting the Secretary of State to approve the closure of 'Readheads' landing which nobody used while at the same time an apparently busy shipyard, affected equally by the Port of Tyne's expansion plans was allowed to relocate to residential area with very little attempt at planning control. That UK Docks was offered a new location by the Port of Tyne for their shipyard seems to have been overlooked. The meeting between UK Docks and the Planning Department on Aug 13th or 20th 2013 may have needed to be private for some reason but don't you agree that there should have been some public consultation before this redevelopment was allowed to proceed.

It has just come to my notice that the 'shed' was signed off by Building Control on the 13th June. Is it now the custom for them to sign off buildings that were not built to plan?

Shall I raise these under 248789 - Stage 2 or will you consider them this 253539 - Stage 3?

Yours sincerely
Michael Dawson

----- Original Message -----

Subject: Slipway Shed - River Drive.
From: mick.dawson@theharbourview.co.uk
Date: Fri, April 4, 2014 3:48 pm
To: "George Mansbridge" by letter
Cc: "Gordon Atkinson" <gordon.atkinson@southtyneside.gov.uk>
Main Political Parties

Dear Mr Mansbridge

It a month since I sent Mr Atkinson an email on behalf of the residents affected by the

redevelopment of the UK Docks site on River Drive and I have not received a satisfactory reply to the request that STC Planning Office meet with the residents to explain their action or rather lack of it over the slipway shed on River Drive. I am writing to you as I know Mr Atkinson is away and I know that you have been corresponding with another dissatisfied resident.

Until we as a group get an answer to the bulk of the questions caused by STC in allowing the shed, not only to be built to unauthorised plans (by their own admission on 13th Feb) but also allowing it to be put into use i.e. slipping of Port of Tyne vessel on 17th March, they must expect a continuous stream of complaints.

You, the Council should I say, have known since at least the 27th of September 2013 that the shed has not been built to plan and appear to be evading the issue since then and we would like to know the justification for your attempts to cover this up. It looks like a) you treat the outcrys in 1996 and 2001 as nothing b) the Townhall meeting of 25th Nov about ST/1146/13/COND was used to misinform representatives of the residents, they were incorrectly advised that the structure met legal requirements and c) the reticence of any elected members of the Council (ward and Planning committee) to comment on the inappropriate development on the riverside. To cap it all there was an article in the local paper on Apr 1st showing most flattering photograph of the offending shed saying that it was only 36ft high. The author of the article may have got away with saying that in September but not now.

You should know that it is over 50 ft high and that is what we have been saying for months now. It's planned height is about 42ft.

Mr Atkinson's and now your retisence to answer any of the questions arising from this most inappropriate development, and also the refusal of any of the elected members of the ward or planning committee to say anything leads me to think that local politics may be involved. Elections in May (closing date for registration 18th Apr) may have something to do with it and the fact that the Cllr for this ward is up for election is also the Chairman of the Planning Committee. We cannot really be expected to wait another two weeks for a response.

The other thing that make me think that the issue is fundamentally a political one is item 4 on the list of items for consideration of the Planning Committee on Monday 7th.

For those interested please see attached. I have not attached all 60 pages of the report but the interesting part may be found at:

<http://www.southtyneside.info/applications/2/councillorsandcommittees/viewdocument.aspx?id=25175> page 35

This political hot cake is about to slip under the radar and be 'rubberstamped' by a largely ill informed committee and is possibly the main reason why the council has been obfuscating, misleading if not outrightly lying to a group of residents about an ill considered planning application at the other end of the town for 7 months.

The above is why I am copying this mail to the main political parties. The response to our press release has been underwelming to say the least.

I ask again that the working at UK Docks Slipway on River Drive be stopped until this issue is resolved.

yours sincerely

Michael
Dawson