From: Paul Hepburn
Sent: 11 August 2017 12:25
To: Michael Dawson <daw50nmdj@hotmail.co.uk>
Subject: Re: UK Docks Expansion of Works on River Drive

Mick

You may have already been told this. It seems as if the UK Docks is in the process of lengthening its already 'NOT BUILT TO PLAN' shed.

A tall crane is at the moment installing at least two new framework legs similar to those already used in the shed construction. These are at the roadway end of the existing shed.

Paul H

On 11 Aug 2017, at 08:59, Michael Dawson <<u>daw50nmdj@hotmail.co.uk</u>> wrote:

Hi Julie,

Please notice I've switched to Hotmail and put a special post into 'theharbourview.co.uk' for you. This is the correspondence that has been 'lost' to the world when the Head of Development Services asked his staff to introduce a new complaint 253539 and effectively killing off 248789 (item 6). The basic trouble we are having is that we are up against a Council who misuse their own complaints system to obscure bad planning decisions and cover up mistakes made by the staff in the Planning Office and I've chosen as an example what went on at the beginning of my complaint - thatUK Docks had not complied with the second condition of the permission granted in 1996.

- 1. The first device is not to record the complaint and try and fob you off (Mr Cunningham, 13-Jan);
- 2. if you are persistent they do raise a Job (the name they give to complaint, enquiry or whatever) but it will not be what your actual complaint was about if they cannot defend their actions;
- 3. they then use the opportunity to introduce misinformation(Mr Atkinson, 15-Jan, that the road end has an approved height of 15.5m)and this is the most insidious device and is the most corrupt use of the complaints procedure. It is the hardest to tackle because you cannot get your complaint back on course and by the time it gets to the LGO (the 4th Stage in the Council's Complaints Procedure) your actual complaint is lost amongst the many misrepresentations made by them (i.e that the gable end on 8296/14 is not to scale);
- 4. they refer you up or down the chain without attending to your complaint (Mr Cunningham did this to Melanie, Matthew and no doubt yourselves and many others besides myself at the beginning).
- 5. and finally they just don't respond (Mr Cunningham when asked whether the road end height had been approved).
- 6. switching the emphasis of the complaint in this case from on of noncompliance to enforcement.

This last one made me look at the pair of drawings presented by UK Docks presented to him and copied to us, very carefully and my observations on it are available in <u>Plans and Drawings</u>.

To put it bluntly, that pair of drawings were presented the Council to deceive them about the height of the shed and it looks like they were until the 9th of September 2013 but by then the framework was up and it gave the Council a problem which I don't think I have to explain.

The Council should not have taken the word of UK Docks that they were building the shed to approved plans, but they did, and I exposed them when I went and measured the width for myself in November 2013. Cheers,

Mick

From:Mick Dawson <<u>mick.dawson@theharbourview.co.uk</u>> Sent:11 August 2017 07:14 To:Mick Dawson Subject:Fw: UK Docks Expansion of Works on River Drive

----- Original Message ----- **From:**Julie and Dave **To:**philb@gclaw.co.uk **Cc:**<u>Mick Dawson</u> **Sent:**Tuesday, August 08, 2017 7:13 AM

Phil: we have had significant problems in putting forward planning objections to South Tyneside Council.

Please see: theharbourview website (as in the link above - Mick Dawson is our most tenacious campaigner!).

The basic facts are:

• Harbour View estate construction - 1991;

• Boat yard adjacent to properties was used for private boat storage and 6 monthly repairs on local ferries;

• Tyne Slipway/UK Docks purchased the boat yard in 1994; put in planning requests 1996;

• within 2 months of 5 year planning deadline the owners put in 'shed' foundations;

• In September 2013 they started construction on the shed, which we have continued to argue breaches the original plans of 1996: it is more complicated than this (please see the website!)

The council and yard owners ignore our Human Rights re: privacy; right to enjoy our properties (our garden fences are toe to toe with the yards fence).

Further planning permission was granted 2 years ago, and we suffer daily noise re the new constructions in the yard.

This is NIMBYism: it actually IS in our backyard! We are helpless in our protests that the yard should not be being granted its rights over residents as there is no special ('magic') fence/dividing line between us to allow for a Gen Ind site to function so close to private homes.

Unfortunately we do not have the money or power to fund a Judicial Review etc.

Help!

Julie Routledge

Sent from Samsung Mobile