

Dear Rebecca,

I'll certainly let you know when I get a reply from the Council about the conduct of the Corporate Lead.

During the recess I also wrote to the Local Government Ombudsman (LGO) about the misrepresentations made by the Council and received a reply, both attached, the subject of the emails being, "Confidential: Case ID – 17001436"

The pretence of confidentiality is a charade and is being used, in my opinion, to cover the fact that Mr Lewis has no answer to the last two paragraphs of my email:

If the Council had admitted that the cover was 2.7m too high when we had protested in 2013 about it, we would not have needed to raise a complaint about it in January 2014 and certainly not needed to involve the LGO and I hope I have explained why I had not responded within the 'time limit'.

That a Senior Council Planner (# 31) thought that he could get away with passing off an unauthorised drawing from 1997 as a legal one from 1996 (#34) is shocking but sadly it appears to have worked, and it does not reflect very well on the office of the Local Government Ombudsman.

We, the local residents, were told at a meeting in November 2013 that the cover was 'legal' when we were fairly certain it was not because the Case Officer was not answering any questions about the planned height.

It transpired that it was too high and one only has to look at the approved drawings to see that. The Council conceded the point in February 2014 but we soon heard they had reverted to their earlier view about it. Confirmation of this arrived in May with their letter to some residents in response to the petition and that was the basis of my complaint to the LGO.

That UK Docks had started work before the agents Maughan Reynolds Partnership Ltd submitted their plans/drawing was a problem of their own making and we were lead to believe they even surprised the Council by starting work so quickly.

The Council's problem is that UK Docks submitted a different set of plans to what they intended to build but the agents stuck to the approved plans, apart from a minor material variation, when they submitted a drawing to the Council for approval shortly after construction began.

The Residents problem, and I include myself, was that although we had our suspicions about the drawings submitted by UK Docks we had little to confirm it the until the publication of the agent's drawing in December 2013.

My problem is that I was the only person prepared to challenge what we were being told at the meeting in November 2013. The meeting had been called by Cllr Anglin to ensure that if any development does go ahead that it is legal and if not legal then not to go ahead. The case officer said it was 'legal'.

I going to chase Cllr Anglin re Sunday Working (email to you 21-Apr) and the denial by the Council that eventually lead to my letter to Mr Lewis and let you know how I get on.

There is hardly anyone in the Council that comes out of this untarnished!

Kind regards  
Michael