

From: [Michael Dawson](#)
To: [ATKINSON, Rebecca](#)
Sent: Monday, April 03, 2017 2:20 PM
Subject: Conduct of Head of Development Services

Dear Rebecca,

I hope the meeting that Emma had with the people at UK Docks went well but I do not think that the Director, Jonathan Wilson, would have allowed them to come clean with her.

As I said before, all of the Council Officers involved with this development and I mean all, from the Case Officers to the Chief Executive, have left something to be desired about their conduct and here is the third – Mr G Mansbridge the Head of Development Services.

To recap (I now use 'cover' to describe the enclosure, shelter or shed):

1. The Case Officer: just kept repeating that the cover was approved.
2. The Planning Manager:
 - did not register with the Council that the cover was non-compliant;
 - structured his responses to include misrepresentations of the plans to be used later as facts.

After what we took to be an admission that the cover was too high as well as too wide, we (I was writing on behalf of the local residents) asked the Council to consider asking for its removal and the issue was passed up the management chain to the Head of Development Services, Mr George Mansbridge. This would be the normal escalation of a complaint to stage 2 but this is not normal because because the complaint was not properly registered and Mr Mansbridge has to respond to both the Petition, and later, my complaint that his staff have not handled the complaint properly.

With regard to the Petition: we have no evidence that the addressee, the Chief Executive has ever seen it. He did not have the courtesy to even acknowledge its receipt at the Town Hall.

As you will see from the attached paper, Conduct of HDS, Mr Mansbridge appears to be no better than his staff. There is much detailed correspondence and to reduce the number of attachments I have used references to the website, theharbourview.co.uk/docs.

Incidentally the one detail I have attached (from 1A; 1B is same but not so clear), can be viewed at 100 or 130% to show that the 12.500 dimension is wrong. An ordinary desk rule will suffice to show 3cm and 10cm, not 12.5cm which equates to a height of the road end of 13m.

It should be simple enough to say that he did not properly respond to correspondence but he, like some of his staff before him, has responded in such a way as to deny that the cover has been built too high and pass the responsibility for allowing it to be built and used without planning permission, up the chain of command.

I look forward to hearing what UK Docks have to say for themselves.

Yours sincerely,
Michael Dawson