

On 9 Apr 2014, at 17:22, Gordon Atkinson <Gordon.Atkinson@southtyneside.gov.uk> wrote:

Dear Miss Todd

Thank you for your email, which I acknowledge receipt of. I need to speak with my Head of Service, George Mansbridge, about this case, but he is off this week.

Regards

Gordon Atkinson

From: Melanie Todd

Sent: 07 April 2014 10:50

To: Gordon Atkinson

Subject: Re: Breach of Planning Conditions, UK Docks, River Drive [NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED]

Dear Mr Atkinson,

Could you please answer the following as a matter of urgency:

Please explain your justification for stating that "The council in its role as planning authority cannot act to stop work which relates to the lawful use of the site for general industrial purposes. The status of the structure can have no bearing on the continuing use of the site". I ask this because the Grant of Planning Permission Conditions refer and relate directly to the actions of the work taking place within the structure, e.g. conditions 3,4,and 5 in particular. You should understand my frustration at your callous dismissal of legitimate points and questions raised by myself and other resident constituents. Your uneven -handedness in seeming to protect the interests of the developers against our legitimate concerns and the interests set out in the Grant of Planning Permission reasons for the conditions. The indisputable breaches of planning conditions by the developers is unacceptable. You appear not to be observing your mandatory statutory obligations to enforce planning law.

With regard to your statement "I will be writing to those residents who have raised queries over the construction of the structure in due course once matters have been fully assessed, and I'm not sure at this stage when that will be." This is not acceptable. Could you please explain:

- 1) How you will make transparent the process by which you will be assessing these matters?
- 2) Who is involved in this process?
- 3) What role do the resident constituents play in this process?
- 4) How will you be publicly sharing this process and your conclusions?
- 5) What is STMBC protocol for responding to resident constituents questions?
- 6) Why can't you give us the timescale for this to be fully assessed when the resident constituents have been raising these questions and pointing out the facts for the last 7 months?

Has STMBC signed off the construction of the shed? If so how can this have happened in light of the established breaches of the Grant of Planning Permission, which was supplied to myself by Mr Peter Cunningham on 5th September 2013?

Could you please confirm the detail of the foundations signed off by STMBC in 2001 and their relation to the original Grant of Planning Permission which was for a smaller structure than that that has been built?

Could you please confirm whether STMBC Planning Department/Building Control was informed of the rebuilding of the slipway after 2005, and if so what was signed off at that time?

Yours Sincerely,

Melanie Todd(Miss)