

Extract of criticism from a letter to the Council's Corporate Lead in September 2016. It was part of my response to the Council's decision to Section me because I challenged the Chief Executive to come clean about UK Docks' shed and to admit that it had no approval, having been built 3m taller than planned.

In it, I say that, in the light of the volume of misrepresentation and or misinformation generated by the Council concerning the development on River Drive, I take her threat of Section F action as offensive and somewhat hypocritical. Consider the bullet points in her letter and the closing paragraph, *If the Principal Planning Officer had answered etc.*:-

- Letter to MP Trevelyan dated 1 June 2015 advising her of your complaint -
Actually the letter of 1-Jun-2015 was from MP Trevelyan to the Chief Executive and copied to me;
- Email 4 December 2015 to Gary Simmonette and the Planning Team referencing the original boat shed dimensions, which had been addressed through the complaints procedure.
If you had read my email 4-Dec to Mr Simmonette you would realise it was about the illogicality of applying for planning permission to extend a shed that had been built without planning permission. It had not been addressed through the complaints procedure. The final draft from the Ombudsman was issued on the 15 th April 2015 Please note that the comment about drawing 8296/14 not being to scale did not appear until her final draft yet she says the Council made no comment;
- Email 1 February 2016 regarding the February committee meeting, making reference to misinformation and/or misrepresentation by the Council in supplying information to the Local Government Ombudsman.
The email of the 1 February was from the Head of Development Services to me. Mr Simmonette had not responded to my email about the illogicality of applying for planning permission to extend a shed that had been built without planning permission. Instead of passing it to Mr Mansbridge to pass to the Planning Committee he had passed it to Ms Hoy to make sure it never saw the light of day;
- Letter 8 July 2016 to the Chief Executive and the Ombudsman
The letter of 8-Jul-2016 was not copied to the Ombudsman – it was published as an open letter. I had not written to the Ombudsman by that time as there are number of items of misrepresentation, about the development on River Drive, made by the Council to residents, the LGO and an MP that needed sorting first;
- submitted repeated complaints, essentially regarding the same issue, after our complaints process has been exhausted -
There was only one complaint submitted by me and that was on 10 th January 2014. That one was first overwritten by the Planning Manager as 248789 and when he had conceded to our claim that the shed was actually taller than planned, the Head of Development Services overwrote it with 253539 thus rewriting the history of the complaint;
- adopted a 'scattergun' approach: pursuing a complaint or complaints with the authority and, at the same time, with a Member of Parliament/a councillor/independent auditor/the Standards Board/local police/solicitors -
I have not written to the local police, independent auditors or the Standards Board which you are implying.
If I think that the Council is acting improperly on any issue I believe I am entitled to write to my MP – it is up to the MP whether he or she takes up my case.

I wrote to my ward Councillors because they, apart from the Chairman of the Planning Committee(Cllr Wood), attended the meeting where we were told the shed was 'legal'. Are you suggesting that the Councillors should not be told that they were misinformed by a Principal Planning Officer of the Council?

I included members of the Residents Group Committee as well because I had to relay the 'facts' to a meeting with them a few hours after the same meeting where we were told the shed was 'legal'. I did not believe what I had been told by the Officer and it took me 2 months and numerous emails to prove that shed was not 'legal' or should I say compliant. Are you suggesting that members of the Residents Group should remain ignorant of the fact that the shed was not compliant and built without planning permission?

- refused to accept the decision of the Council or Local Government Ombudsman, by arguing points of detail -

The Council/Local Government Ombudsman have based their decisions on drawings provided by UK Docks. These were not authorised and one of them was incomplete because there were vital details missing.

I based my arguments on documents provided by their Agents in pursuance of ST/1146/13/COND which I considered more valid.

One can see from the drawing provided by the Agent, 8296/14, or from the only approved drawing from 1996 that the shed is 3m taller than planned. Both show that that it would be have been wrong to accept the lie that the shed had approval told at the meeting arranged by the the owner of 72 Greens Place and Councillor Anglin who were out of kilter with the the rest of of the residents except the owner of 71 Greens place and to accept the decision by the Council to misinform the Ombudsman and there would have been no need for:-

1. me to raise the original complaint;
2. it to be deleted/replaced;
3. me to pester the Planning Manager until he conceded the point about the shed being too tall;
4. the residents to have gone to the bother of arranging the meeting at the SSSC;
5. the residents to raise the petition;
6. the Head of Development Services to lie to the Petitioners about the height of the shed in his response to it;
7. the Head of Development Services to overwrite the complaint that the shed was too tall with the contradiction that it was not too tall;
8. me to have to arrange the meeting to view 8296/14;
9. Customer Advocacy to have to write a fake stage 3 report;
10. a planning officer to give misinformation and or misrepresentation to the Ombudsman;
11. the Council to misinform the MP for Berwick;
12. me to have to have to involve a second inspector for the Local Government Ombudsman;
13. the second inspector to cover for items 1 to 12 by conflating item 1 with item 12;
14. the dishonesty/hypocrisy of the Corporate Lead in her desire to take another shot at me, the messenger.

If the Principal Planning Officer had answered the question about the shed's height, asked of him in the first few days of it's existence, then none of the above need have occurred but we would not have had confirmation that some Local Authorities were happy to misuse the services of the Local Government Ombudsman to hide the wrongdoings of their planning and building control officers and it is a sad reflection on the Ombudsmen that they are willing partners in the practice.