

Dear Ms Hayton

Town Hall Meeting: 25-Nov-13: Misinformation

I make no apologies for digging through early correspondence to establish the truth behind the slipway shed on River Drive. When decisions are made about whether a development has been built to plan it is obvious that non-approved drawing and plans with missing details or errors must be discarded. It was built without planning permission in late 2013 and was in breach of planning control with regard to the second condition (1m too wide and 2.7m too high) as soon as the first frame was erected.

The second condition of the grant for ST/0242/96UD:

- The development to which this permission relates shall be carried out in complete accordance with the approved plans plans and specifications.

The approved plans were for a shed 22m x 15.5m (river end) x 12.2m. Examination of the two approved (authorised) drawings, that we have seen, will confirm this:

- 1996 – 8296/2: [Stamped 8/7/96 by T&WDC](#) shows road end = 12.7m;
- 2013 – 8296/14: [ST/1146/13/COND - Approved by STC 14/10/13](#).

When UK Docks had finished the structural framework it, it could be seen that frames were for one with the dimensions, 22m x 18.2m x 13.1m (according to the measurements made by Mr Cunningham). Please note that the height refers to the river end of the structure.

8296/1A or 1B are not authorised, presumably because they show both ends of the shed as 15.5m. As the shed does not slope down towards the river one end is out by the gradient of 2.7m, and reference to the approved drawings dictates that it is the road end.

Drawings 1A or B could be said to represent the approved plans if the height dimension on the river end, 15.5m, is accepted as true rather than that on the landward end. Bearing in mind both of these drawings give a planned width of 12.2m one could reasonably say that the shed was a meter wider than permission allowed from 2001 and 2.7m taller than permission allowed from the 5th or 6th September 2013.

I used 8296/14 in my arguments with the Council because:

- it was approved by the Council 14-Oct-13;
- it included the note "strips to draw back to each side to allow access for boats" and boats come onto the slipway from the river;
- it included a scale (1:100) drawing of the [river gable end showing it to be 15.5m](#) rather than 18.2m in height;
- the Agent would have taken care to base the amendment on the authorised plans of 1996.

As you now know I arranged to meet with Mr Mansbridge to [view this drawing on July 8th 2014 but it was not produced](#). The Planning Manager brought 8296/1A and 2 along instead, and I when I pointed out to the assembled company that 1A had the same dimension on each end, the meeting was effectively closed.

If you take a look at 8296/14, and I suggest you use the A1 copy from your drawings and plans store and take a ruler, you will see that the gable end is 16cm high and the width is a bit over 12cm and then you will understand why the Planning Manager did not bring it to the meeting.

It contradicts nearly everything he told me about the height and:

- what we were told at the meeting, 25th November 2013;
- what Council had been telling the residents during 2013;
- what was said by the Council following the complaint of the 10-Jan-14.

The complaint was based on the drawing 8296/14 as 8296/2 had not been made available to the public until the end of January and that was three weeks after UK Docks had restarted work on the shed, and I raised the complaint.

The responses following the complaint lead to the Council misinforming the Local Government Ombudsman partly illustrated [in Fallout 2](#) but it is the email from Cllr Anglin in response to my observation that the shed was wider than planned that I wish to comment on here:

Please see below the reply from Peter (Cunningham).

" Hello – I confirmed at our meeting with Mr Dawson and others on 25th ~~Sept~~ Nov 2013 that I had measured the width and length of the ground floor external footprint and height of the structure and that these dimensions were all in accordance with the attached approved drawing and planning permission.

*Councillor Anglin, 19-Dec-13*

By then Mr Cunningham was sending out 8296/1A as an approved drawing, which it is not. He may have sent out Mr Wilson's drawings (8296/1B + cropped 8296/2) to Cllr Anglin but again, they were not authorised either, and as I have shown above they could only be said to represent the approved height [if one conceded that the road end is wrong by 2.7m](#).

Both Cllr Anglin and myself were wrongly advised at the meeting, i.e. that the dimensions were in accordance with the approved plans, and he accepted this misinformation too easily. Perhaps he thought it OK that Mr Cunningham could not provide any evidence to back up what he was saying but I did not, partly because he did not provide any but especially since the publication of the Agent's Drawing 8296/14 on the 10-Dec-13.

I think I can say with certainty that the meeting of 25-Nov-2013 was a pivot point in the life of the shed. On one side, the side that say it was approved (or legal) there was Mr Cunningham, the Councillors, and that includes Cllrs MacMillan and Wood as well as Cllr Anglin, the brothers of the local Masonic Lodge (Haig and Watson) and presumably his line Manager, and on the other, the residents who claim it was built without planning permission.

While you are looking at 8296/14, which must have been dropped onto Mr Cunningham's desk on 20-Sep-13, I suggest you look at the [authorised copy of 8296/2](#) which must of dropped onto his desk a week or so earlier, and you will see the height of the shed clearly marked on the left hand side or landward end. It works out at 12.7m.

The reason why Mr Cunningham and those that followed him could behave as they did is because the Council misinform the Ombudsman to cover their tracks and that is why the shed is still there and why the Council is now stonewalling Cllr Hamilton, myself and others. Where we go from here is rather up to you.

Yours sincerely  
Michael Dawson