

From: Michael Dawson <daw50nmdj@hotmail.co.uk>
Sent: 20 January 2017 15:29
To: Cllr John Anglin; Customer Advocates
Cc: Kevin.Burrell@southtyneside.gov.uk
Subject: Fw: Non Compliance (Base of Enclosure) and Sunday Working, UK Docks, River Drive.

Dear Councillor Anglin,

I have now attached a dated Condition2_base.pdf.

I think I need to eliminate what I consider the equivocation of Mr Cunningham and his Manager regarding the variation in the planned width of the enclosure before I deal with its planned height.

I quote from the bottom of the first page of Condition2_base.pdf which I have now dated:

The Council should have known since the inspection of the foundations on 22nd May 2001 or when they measured the frames on 17th September 2013 to be meter wider than planned and therefore not compliant. That is why I wrote to you (trail below: 16-Dec) letting everybody know that we had all been misinformed. Why Mr Cunningham would not accept my findings is a mystery.

Both the Officers said or implied the enclosure was compliant when it was not.

I will also take this opportunity to let you know that I have still not received a case/feedback number identification number for Sunday working. The photograph that I attached to my email to you on 9th January copied to Customer Advocates is dated 18-Dec-2016.

I seem to have two case numbers for Noise and none for Sunday Working.

I'll leave that for Environmental Health and Customer Advocacy to sort out.

Yours sincerely

Michael Dawson

From: Michael Dawson <daw50nmdj@hotmail.co.uk>
Sent: 13 January 2017 07:39
To: Cllr John Anglin
Cc: Customer Advocates; Mick Dawson
Subject: Non Compliance (Base of Enclosure) UK Docks, River Drive.

Dear Councillor Anglin,

Please see Condition2_base.pdf attached - I refer to the other attachments in it.

It is a letter about my observations about the way the Council have handled my complaint raised since I wrote to you in December 2013. Things have got worse since the with the way they handle any complaint to do with UK Docks and this has much to do with the Section F Action that Corporate Lead has imposed.

You will see from my letter that her action is totally unreasonable but please note that I exclude the conduct of Ms Hoy from any of this which, by comparison, is exemplary.

I will try and getCondition2_height.pdf to you before the end of next week.

Yours sincerely,

Michael Dawson