

From: ATKINSON, Rebecca  
Sent: 29 March 2017 16:37  
To: Michael Dawson  
Subject: RE: Conduct of the Case Officer – Mr P Cunningham

Hi Michael  
Thanks for this.  
Emma has a meeting with UK Docks this Friday, once we have spoken with them and collated all of the information then we will be in touch further with next steps.  
Best wishes  
Rebecca

---

From: Michael Dawson  
Sent: 29 March 2017 15:11  
To: ATKINSON, Rebecca  
Subject: Conduct of the Case Officer – Mr P Cunningham

Dear Rebecca,  
I'm sorry for the delay. I've looked again at what has been sent to you and it occurs to me that we need to get to the reason why the Council have been acting so dishonestly about the UK Docks development on River Drive. Please see attached.

It looks like Mr Cunningham accepted what UK Docks were telling him about the size of the shelter and it looks like no-one was checking what they were saying was true. There is no record of anyone from the Council going onto the site to measure the size of the cover EIR – Summary 2001-2014.

Even if Mr Cunningham did not know that UK Docks intended to build some 3m above the planned height when he met them in August to discuss the second phase of the development he would soon have got to know that they had. It was common knowledge along the river that it was too high which is why one of my neighbours, Miss Melanie Todd questioned him about it.

I think it was the misinformation (36ft is about 11m which is a ridiculous estimate of the height and the angry man was Paul not Peter) published in the Gazette on 9-Sep that would have woken Council Staff who had been around for some time to the fact that there was something not quite right about the development. Perhaps someone brought it to the attention of Mr Cunningham because by mid afternoon on that day, the shutters came down. Apart from the Planning Manager, and he tried his best to evade the issue, nobody on the Council will answer any question about the planned height of the cover.

The most telling remark in the article was made by a spokesman for the applicant, UK Docks, who said: "All I can say is that we have been through all the controls with the planners, and the work meets all the necessary legal requirements. All we are doing is going ahead with the previous planning permission."

By the time of the meeting in November we also had information that it was too wide as well and it was that piece of information with which we were able to initially establish that the cover had been built without planning permission.

Mr Cunningham's email to me in December was disgraceful. Not only had he sent unapproved copies of the plans three times he said, "this is the end of the matter as far as I

am concerned. Please do not email me again”.

The Conduct of the Planning Office which I sent to you on 13-Mar was basically about Mr Gordon Atkinson and how he initially agreed with his Principal Planning Officer when he should have been paying more attention to the fact that UK Docks had been allowed to build the cover without planning permission.

The conduct of the Head of Development Services was no better, nor was that of Customer Advocacy. I'll do them next then jump to Hayley Johnson and Gary Simonette and then return to the suspected collusion of Local Government Ombudsman. That is my plan at the moment.

Yours sincerely,  
Michael Dawson