

From: M Dawson
To: Planning Manager
Subject: RE: Slipway Development - Work Continues
Date: Fri, 24 Jan 2014 16:45:00

Dear Mr Atkinson,

Thank you for reply. However, I am not satisfied that my questions have been answered. The core matter is that the structure we see on Riverside Drive is not consistent with any of the drawings you have provided.

In my explanation I will use drawing 8296/14 (ST114613COND Details 300913.pdf). This is the only drawing of the Slipway Cover on the Planning Portal i.e. the only one in the public domain. It has however sufficient information to support my argument. I have attached my annotated copy. Before discussing this drawing I would like to raise two issues:-

1. The overall width of the structure.

I maintain the overall width of the structure is 13.2m and first mentioned this in an e-mail dated 16th Dec. You have informed me that the width of the structure has been measured, but have not stated the dimension or informed me that my measurement is incorrect. You have only told me that the measurements are to the approved plan. We are still waiting to see the approved plans (date stamped and approved in 1996).I would also like to add that as the columns are vertical it would seem reasonable to assume that the footings, laid in 2001, are also 13.2m.

2.The plans: 'Approved drawings'

Under this heading you discuss drawings numbered 8296/1A,1B, 2 and 4. In your discussion of drawing 1A and 1B you report what we already know. I have repeatedly stated that these two drawings are not date stamped and approved by Tyne and Wear Development Corporation in 1996.

Your further discussion tells me about two more drawings, Nos. 8296/2, 8296/4, that are date stamped and approved by Tyne and Wear Development Corporation in 1996. Why have these two drawings not been provided to residents and why are they not available on the planning portal? If these two drawings are approved Tyne and Wear Development Corporation why are 1A and 1B not similarly dated and approved.

Attachment: Notes 8296_14.pdf

To return to drawing no 8296/14. Using the dimensions given on this drawing for the 'portal col' (.687 x .254) one can ascertain that the height of the NNW elevation ('access for boats') is 15.6 meters and the width, across the supporting columns, 12.2m. As the rise in slipway is about 3m then the SSE elevation should be of the order of 12.5m.

The height of the current structure is 15.5m at the SSE end which you maintain is built to approved drawings. Why then do the dimensions of drawing number 8296/14 differ from drawings no 1A and 1B? I would assume that the Agent, Maughan, Reynolds Partnership Ltd', would refer to copies of approved drawings to complete and submit the drawing required to comply with conditions 3 and 4. How then does the current structure meet condition 2? In essence the SSE elevation of the built structure is 15.5m high x 13.2m wide, while all indications are that the original planned SSE elevation is 12.5m x 12.2m.

Could you please respond to the questions I ask in the body of this message and forward copies of the date stamped and approved, Tyne and Wear Development Corporation, drawings numbers 8296/2 and 8296/4 which you advise me are held by the planning office.

yours sincerely
Michael Dawson

