

Tyne Slipway & Eng Co Ltd Erection of a Shelter ST/0242 /96

From: mick.dawson@theharbourview.co.uk

Date: 17/09/2019 (14:55:15 BST)

To: Building Control

Cc: Cllr Angela Hamilton, Cllr David Francis, Cllr Anglin, Emma Lewell-Buck MP, Stephen Hepburn MP, Customer Advocates

3 Attachments

[Grant_Sept96.pdf \(310 KB\)](#)

[ST0242_8296_1a_2_4.pdf \(591 KB\)](#)

[Footings2010.jpg \(436 KB\)](#)

Dear Sir or Madam.

Please see the grant, set of drawings and photograph attached.

8296/1A is not approved, presumably because it shows both ends of the shed to be the same height (15.5m) while also showing a gradient of 2.7m between them. One of the dimensions is obviously wrong and reference to to 8296/2, one of which has been authorised and gives the landward end as 12.7m. When one takes into account that the footings at that point are at 96.1m the permitted height at the river end is therefore 15.5m. The length and width are clearly given as 22m and 12.2m respectively.

The shed we see today is 27.5m long (my estimate using the sixth, photograph of the set of footings laid in 2001- attached), 18.2m high at the river end and 13.1m wide as measured by the Council in September 2013. It was therefore in breach of planning control in length and breadth since 2001 and in height since September 2013 but nothing has been done about it because no enforcement orders were made. It was claimed that the variation from plan was not material so there was nothing to enforce.

Following approaches to the current owners by Councillor Hamilton and the MP for South Shields, they - UK Docks, are now saying that they they were given permission for it retrospectively which I know to be untrue.

Please confirm that this is so and issue a somewhat belated enforcement notice and put the argument about whether the 2nd condition was met back where it belongs: between UK Docks and the Council and not where it has been for 5 years; between the local residents who say it is too high and the Council who say it is not.

It will be their choice then between removing/rebuilding the shed to the approved plan (22m x 15.5m x 12.2m) with sloping sides or applying retrospectively for permission for what they now have (27.5m x 18.2m x 13.1m).

In both cases they will have conceded that we and not the Council were correct about the breaches in planning control but the second will additionally expose the Council, and quite justifiably, to charges of corruption and misleading the Local Government Ombudsman.

Yours sincerely
Michael Dawson