

From: Michael Dawson
Sent: 11 July 2017 14:43
To: ATKINSON, Rebecca
Cc: Cllr John Anglin
Subject: Town Hall Meeting 25 Nov and Complaints against UK Docks.
Dear Rebecca,

Please refer to the email I sent to Councillor Anglin, and copied to you, on Saturday.

I've added the following notes to expand on my claim (top of page 4) that if Mr Cunningham, the Principal Planning Officer had been a little more honest in his dealings with us the initial complaint need not have been made.

The format of brief email and .pdf document was used because I needed to cross reference quite a few documents to prove many a point. The alternative is a large number of attachments or URLs placed straight into an email.

I used the stream of emails following the November meeting at the Town Hall to show that Mr Cunningham was being less than straightforward with me. Luckily I had the foresight to forward it to the neighbour who originally complained to you about the development on River Drive and Microsoft have been keeping it secure for me for three and a half years.

I had already advised Mr Cunningham that the cover was nearly a meter wider than planned when he wrote:

Mr Dawson – once again – I have measured this on site and have copied the 1996 plans across to you twice already (attached again for your use) and I have explained during our meeting that the base and height of the structure are compliant...this is the end of the matter as far as I am concerned.

Please do not email me again.

It appears that if he did visit the site he got the width wrong. I managed to get it nearly right from 40m away. I had asked for the plans 'seen' at the meeting where we had been told the height was approved but he kept on sending plans that had not been authorised in 1996.

Even after I formally complained about the width (and the height), the Planning Manager, Mr Atkinson, virtually repeated the claim made by Mr Cunningham before the complaint, and please note the measurements are not in accordance those shown on the approved drawings:

The dimensions of the steelwork have been checked on site and they are in accordance with the measurements shown on the approved drawings.

There are no drawing approved or otherwise which shows that to be true about the width and I have to ask him, and bear in mind, it is over 4 months since the framework was completed:

You have informed me that the width of the structure has been measured, but have not stated the dimension or informed me that my measurement is incorrect. You have only told me that the measurements are to the approved plan. We are still waiting to see the approved plans.

He does send me some plans all of which confirm that I am right about the width.

Nobody was copied into the dialogue with the Planning Manager where he conceded that the cover was too high and I am still having troubles Council with respect to the planned height. It is, perhaps, because he did not share this information with the rest of the Council that they felt able to revert to the false claim that there was no material difference in the planned height in their response to our Petition.

That is why I brought Cllr Anglin into the dialogue when I started talking Sunday working.

Yours sincerely,
Michael Dawson.

