

Dear Nicola

Lack of Control

At the beginning we were told a Building Control Surveyor, Mike Telford, was dealing with the Building Regulations application and that must surely include the shed's size. But it soon became apparent from the study of the drawings that it was about 3m taller than planned and later, by me sighting along the frames, that it was too wide as well.

If you look at the plans you will see that the base and height are clearly not in accord with the approved plans so why were we told they were? I maintain that this was hide the fact that no enforcement action was taken and that was why I referred [the issue to Building Control in September 19](#) but have so far their only response was to try and pass it to planning.

From: Deborah.Graham@southtyneside.gov.uk
To: Planningapplications@southtyneside.gov.uk
CC: mick.dawson@theharbourview.co.uk
Tue, 17 Sep 2019 15:12:27 +0100

This email has been classified as: NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Hi Planning

Please see attached and email below which I believe was meant for planning

Regards

Debbie

Debbie Graham Operations & Partnership Officer Town Hall and Civic Offices.

She had been ill advised of course because the original shed was no longer a planning matter. Once the plans have been approved it is up to the building inspector to see that they followed. The plans state very clearly the width as 12.2m and we were told at a meeting with Mr Cunningham, a Principal Planning Officer, in November 2013 that it was compliant i.e. 12.2m wide but it was not, it was 13.1m.

I checked it for myself and found by simple surveying that it was 13.2m wide, the difference being 0.1m, which in 13m is < 1% and therefore negligible. Therefore he was being very economical with the truth when he told Cllr Anglin:

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

He was also wrong about the height; the approved drawings indicate a structure nearly 3m lower than that built and I have dealt with that in some detail in [Evasions & Denials](#) which I have attached. The Council have never properly explained why a Planning Officer was checking the structure and not an inspector from Building Control.

It is obvious the an enforcement notice was not issued in September 2013 and Building Control have now been asked to remedy the situation but have not done so!

Yours sincerely,
Michael Dawson