

From: Gordon Atkinson <Gordon.Atkinson@southtyneside.gov.uk>
Sent: 28 January 2014 11:01
To: 'daw50nmdj@hotmail.co.uk' <daw50nmdj@hotmail.co.uk>
Subject: RE: Slipway Development - Work Continues [NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED] [PROTECT]
This email has been classified as: PROTECT
Attachment: ST1AA3V00023_MFD-EZU14078-37788_3416_001ST1

Dear Mr. Dawson

The Council was contacted by local residents in early September 2013 when the steelwork erection commenced. We weren't able to immediately identify the archive case and the company provided from its own sources copies of drawings numbered 8296/1B and 8296/2, which is why those drawings are stamped received by us 6 Sep 2013. Following a search of our archived file the only drawings that we have that are stamped 'Approved by Tyne and Wear Development Corporation' are 8296/2 and 8296/4. 8296/1A and 8296/1B are consistent with these two stamped drawings in terms of overall dimensions. It is therefore reasonable to say that 8296/1A, 8296/1B, 8296/2 and 8296/4 represent the development which was approved in 1996 (the only difference between 1A and 1B being to the foundation detail).

The dimensions measured by the Council in September are as follows:

Length 22.254m

Width 13.1m

Height at end facing River Drive 15.5m

Height at end facing river 18m

8296/14 is the recent drawing and the only purpose of that is in regards to the condition dealing with the strip curtain door fixing details. You explain that you have measured the height from this drawing as 15.6m, and you seem to have assumed that is the riverside elevation, and have adjusted for the gradient of the slipway and concluded that the height at the River Drive side should be in the order of 3m less. In fact the 15.6m height is the height to River Drive and the height on the river side is some 3m greater.

As I mentioned earlier, drawings of historic cases are not put on the Planning Explorer. Nevertheless, the files are publicly available for inspection and we have for several months shared all information that we have with the members of the public who are interested in this case. As requested, I attach the copies of 8296/2 and 8296/4.

There is no more I can add and I feel that we have answered all your questions. You say at the beginning of your message that you believe that the structure is not consistent with any of the drawings. We have looked at all the material available to us and measured the structural frame when it was erected. I have previously told you that the variation in angle of the pillars is not considered to be material. I can only suggest that if you do wish to pursue this matter further you ask that my Head of Service, George Mansbridge, responds to any remaining points you may have formally under stage 2 of the Council's complaints procedure. You will have to write to him and say specifically what you remain unhappy about.

Regards

Gordon Atkinson

