

Misrepresentation of Plans

Date: 12/03/2021 (09:23:15 GMT)

From: mick.dawson@theharbourview.co.uk

To: Melanie Todd

Cc: Emma Lewell-Buck MP, Anne-Marie Trevelyan MP, John Rumney, Alison Hoy, Nicola Robason, Cllr Anglin, George Mansbridge, Peter Cunningham, Hayley Johnson

Bcc: 20+

Attachments: The Shed and Corruption - March 2021.pdf(222 KB)

Hi Melanie,

I was quite serious when I told Matthew I'd given up FaceBook for Lent. I'd spent most of the weekend before going round in circles with a lot of people including yourselves and getting nowhere, not because of you but because of the way Facebook works. I would have been far more productive in tidying up theharbourview.co.uk but to be honest I find it a wearying task. I think it is its eighth birthday about now.

There was a lot to do but while reviewing the timeline I set up during 2014, I noticed something that should have been obvious to us all in 2013. The time lime petered out about the time of the farce of the Planning Committee meeting of the 1st February 2016. To call it a farce, is a euphemism of course because they were not told that the existing shed had been built without planning permission which was disingenuous if not an outright fraudulent misrepresentation.

What I'd failed to take heed of, although I remember people commenting at the time, was that UK Docks were forced to stop work on their shed in mid September 2013 and it coincided with time the Principal Planning Officer cutting or dissing you because you asked him to confirm the common view that the shed was 3m taller than planned. Whoever told UK Docks to stop work had the upper-hand because they, like us, realised that the passing of the set of drawings was a bit naughty and Mr Cunningham was party to it because he sent you, and the main protesters including me, the misleading plans given to him by UK Docks.

It appears that it was a Gentleman's Agreement that the Council would remain quiet about what was a fraudulent misrepresentation and Mr Cunningham's involvement if UK Docks stopped work on their shed and they did for nearly three months. The agreement was broken with Cllr Anglin's help when he took no minutes of the Town Hall meeting in late November but said all would agree that *"The Exec representatives of the Group accepted that the construction had been made legally as per drawings seen"*. We did not all agree with the Exec representatives because all that Mr Cunningham had done was to replace a pair of drawings with a different one, the misrepresentation still remaining but apparently releasing UK Docks from any obligation for keeping the to the agreement.

Coincidentally, I had become aware that the Council were using a corrupt version of their Complaints Procedure to hide the misdemeanour's of both their planning and building control staff with regard to the what appeared to a be money laundering exercise next door to me on Greens Place. The corrupt version ends up with them giving misinformation to the Local Government Ombudsman and here lies the nub of

the matter, there was no counter to it because they, the Ombudsmen, pass the complaint back to the Council, say that the complaint remains threat of the original complaint or just that one is too late in doing anything about it.

As I've said before, there was not a lot I could do about it without spending a lot of money, but while No 71 maybe history there was a lot we can learn from what went on. The case of UK Docks was a bit different because the construction of their shed was done in two stages. The first was to build a taller and wider shed than that for which they had approval and then put in a request to extend it as part of the redevelopment for the whole site. Both you and I noticed that the ink had hardly dried on the shed's Completion Certificate, 17-Jun-14 when ST/0461/14/FUL went in on the 22-Jun-14. My observation that it made no sense to accept an application to extend a structure built without planning permission fell on stony ground of course but by then our 'complaint' was well on its way to the Ombudsman. That too ended up with the Council giving misinformation to the Ombudsman but I am getting ahead of myself.

To return to the timeline and the plans Mr Cunningham copied across on the 9th September 2013. Firstly, they confirmed the planned width of the shed and that UK Docks had built it a meter wider one than permitted when they erected it on the footings laid in 2001. Secondly, they were not approved, presumably because they contained a mistake i.e. showing both ends to have the same height when there was a gradient of 2.7m difference between them.

What UK Docks and their promoters did not realise was that we could calculate the planned height of the shed from the side elevation of the shed of any architect's drawing because they are always drawn to scale. Fortunately for us the Council published an approved drawing of the river gable end which settled the argument in our favour for once an(d) for all. It was 3m taller than permitted. Mr Cunningham was therefore out of order when he wrote on 20-Dec-13:

/Mr Dawson - once again - I have measured this on site and have copied the 1996 plans across to you twice already (attached again for your use) and I have explained during our meeting that the base and height of the structure are compliant...this is the end of the matter as far as I am concerned./

The meeting to which he referred took place on 25-Nov-13 and no authorised drawings were made available to justify the his point of view. It turned out that there were none and it looks like he was lying if he meant by 'compliant' that the structure (the unclad shed) had been approved.

I have explained this in more detail in the attached pdf file 'The Shed and Corruption' and will get back to you when when I have reviewed the Timeline to the end of 2020.

Kind regards
Mick

 [The Shed and Corruption - March 2021.pdf \(222 KB\)](#)