

To: Garry Simmonette, Planning Enquiries
CC: Dave and Julie Routledge, Emma Lewell-Buck MP, George Mansbridge, Melanie Todd, Cllr MacMillan, Cllr Wood, Cllr Anglin
Date: Fri, December 4, 2015 11:18 am

Amended Planning Application - ST/0461/14/FUL.

Dear Garry,

Please note that on the 3rd of November I moved back to Greens Place. Your Council Tax Section has already been informed of this move.

I have included the Ward Councillors and our MP (mail to Jarrow MP failed – my mistake) because I think they should be apprised of the goings on at UK Docks on River Drive. I've copied in 2 Local Residents for circulation as they see fit.

Please thank Mr Mansbridge for the letter advising me of the amendment to the Application ST/0461/14/FUL.

I wrote to you directly on the 30th Sept because of some concerns of mine about the application (pdf copy attached). My concerns regarding the planning procedures appear to have been covered but you have not replied and the second part of my email has not been addressed. The shed, UK Docks, River Drive was built without planning permission. The request for permission to extend it by 25% appears to be an attempt to bypass the planning regulations, see condition 2 in the original grant of permission "The development to which this permission relates shall be carried out in complete accordance with the approved plans and specifications."

Mr Mansbridge does not believe that the shed has been built 3m too high. I maintain that he has been ill advised by Senior Planning Staff in their misinterpretation of plans or drawings. To make my argument clear I shall bracket Mr Mansbridge and Senior Planners together as the Council.

The dimensions of the shed, measured by the Council in September 2013, are as follows:- Length 22.254m, Width 13.1m, Height at end facing the road 15.5m and Height at end facing the river 18m. Consider drawings:

1: drawing 8296/1A - we are told by Council that the drawing gives the road end of the shed as 15.5m; this is true but the drawing also shows the river end as 15.5m and in the past I have tried to explain that by scaling the river end is 15.5m, not the road end which is some 2.5m less. It has recently come to my attention that 8296/2, one of two drawings in the Council's possession that have been authorised, gives a clearer indication of the shed end heights: we know from 8296/1A that the gradient is 2.656m and this gives the ends of the elevation on drawing 8296/2 heights of 13m and 16m of road end and river end respectively. By way of confirmation it gives the length of the shed of 22m. I have attached copies of both drawings. Do you agree that 8296/1A shows, in truth, that the planned height of the road end is about 12.5m?

2: drawing 8296/14 - this is a detailed engineer's drawing of the river gable end of the shed. The note says "strips to draw back to each side to allow access for boats". The section at the door jam also shows the cladding on the downward or river end indicate to which end the drawing refers. The drawing also shows that the frames including the portal

columns are made from standard joists, size 685 x 254mm, and hence an overall size of 15.6 x 12.2m. The road end is therefore about 12.5m. I have attached a copy of 8296/14. Do you agree that 8296/14 shows the planned height of the road end is about 12.5m and that it has been built 3m higher than authorised in 1996?

Mr Mansbridge said in a letter to me in June 2014, "Your letter of 9th May focuses on the dimensions of the shelter as being built and in particular your view that, as well as being wider than approved, the shelter is also 3m taller. You refer in particular to Drawing 8296/14. That would represent a significant deviation from the approved scheme" and so it does.

The Council have not managed in two years to provide any documents to support their proposition that "Apart from the width these dimensions are either entirely in accordance with the approved plan, or subject to such minor deviation that they are properly categorised as non-material changes" - George Mansbridge, Letter in response to Petition, 2nd May 2014.)

While the existing development was allowed to go ahead without planning permission and the UK Docks was your predecessors decision, they have yet to explain their position and their error in judgement should not be compounded by you making a recommendation to the Planning Committee accept this application. It would not make sense. I believe application ST/0461/14/FUL goes before the Planning Committee of South Tyneside Council on the 12th January 2016.

If you disagree with the proposition that the shed has been built 3 meters higher than planned please give your reasons to me and I will ensure that they are circulated widely. The 12th of January is only 6 weeks away and there is Christmas and The New year to take into account so an early answer would be appreciated.

yours sincerely
Mick Dawson
Greens Place
South Shields