

Correction - 2nd paragraph: delete / a meter wider and / so the last sentence reads:

This was definitely an attempt to mislead, we had been told in November 2013 the height of shed and I just advised his office that it was 3m higher than planned when referring to one of two approved drawings (8296/14).

From: Michael Dawson <daw50nmdj@hotmail.co.uk>
Date: 14/12/2017 07:45 (GMT+00:00)
To: Paul Hepburn
Cc: Melanie Todd, Emma Lewell-Buck MP, Cllr John Anglin, Customer Advocates <Customer.Advocates@southtyneside.gov.uk>
Subject: Re: STC and UK Docks - Height of Shed or Cover: Case Ref: ZA4803

Hi Paul,

Thanks for the plaudit but I've probably given too much detail in the past and they've managed to avoid the main point in my email or letter because they can pick up on some minor point and run with that, so I'll just deal with the planned height of the cover (shed) for the moment, one that should have been dealt with in January 2013.

The Case Officer, Mr Cunningham, referred me back to a meeting where we were told that the cover was compliant when it was not. Then the Planning Manager, Mr Atkinson, repeated that the dimensions of the steelwork had been checked on site and that they were in accordance with the measurements shown on the approved drawings. This was definitely an attempt to mislead one because I had just advised his office that it was a meter wider and 3m higher than planned when referring to one of two approved drawings (8296/14).

The Council closed down all conversation about the height from then on and I believe it was because the only other approved drawing giving dimensions was 8296/2. It was authorised by the original authority in 1996 and shows a planned height of the road end of the cover of 12.7m. I had measured the width for myself and one can safely assume that it is 2.7m too tall because that is the gradient between the ends. The Council still maintains otherwise:

"The matters and allegations raised by your constituent are well documented and have been subject to a number of enquiries from Mr Dawson and other local residents over a lengthy period of time. The matter was ultimately referred by way of complaint to the Local Government Ombudsman, the outcome of which was delivered on 14 April 2015."

That was what the Corporate Lead, Mrs Johnson, wrote to the MP for Northumberland in June 2015 and she was writing on behalf of the Chief Executive. Logic, if nothing else, means that not only has Mrs Johnson, libelled us she has confirmed that the Council have given misinformation/misrepresentation to the Ombudsman. As I have said in the past, the drawings used by UK Docks (and by the Council) to claim an approved height show both ends to be the same height (15.5m) and this can only be true if the shed had the same slope as the slipway and you only have to look to the approved drawings to see that it is the road end that has been specified incorrectly.

After I had complained about the shed being oversize in January 2014 the Council should not have been using the unapproved drawings(1A or 1B) to claim that the shed was the permitted height but they did and the reason for this was that the three meters extra was so in excess of the permitted height that they could not turn a blind eye to it.

We can be certain that it is too high because when the Council are asked for evidence to back up their claim that there is no material variation in height, they fail to produce any.

- Why, nearly four years after they had been informed that the cover was too high, are they still in denial?

It looks as if though we can now add that it is 25% longer, see photo - there are six sets of footings, as well as some 20% taller than planned in 1996 and we should also ask;- why, when the footings were laid in 2001, did UK Docks not check with the Council that the extra set for the sixth frame were OK?

There is a third question to be answered and that is to do with vital details which show the planned height of the landward end to be 12.7m which are missing from one of the drawings presented by UK Docks; - were these vital details removed before they were handed to the Council or were they removed by Mr Cunningham before he sent them on to us in September 2013?

Until we get answers to these 3 questions we must continue to ask them and assume the worst until they are answered.

Cheers,
Michael