From: Michael Dawson

Sent: 06 September 2017 08:39

To: HEATH, Rebecca < rebecca.heath@parliament.uk >

Cc: LEWELL-BUCK, Emma <emma.lewell-buck.mp@parliament.uk>; 5 Residents GP and HV

Subject: Conduct of Cllr Anglin re UK Docks

Dear Rebecca,

I hope you and Emma had a pleasant summer holiday, I've spent mine planning my move back to Amble on September 14th:

I last wrote to you about Cllr Anglin in an email, 11-Jul, explaining that if Mr Cunningham had been more honest with the residents I would not have had to raise my original complaint about the cover not meeting the second planning condition.

I have subsequently explained to Cllr Anglin in great detail how the planning department have continued to claim against all the evidence available that the cover is not 2.7m too high.

I also explained to him:

- how the current planning officer misused the complaints procedure to hide the fact that Sunday working was a breach of the second condition;
- how two officers claimed that the cover was compliant on width after they had been informed that it was 1m too wide;
- the same two officers misused the complaints procedure to avoid any declaration about the planned height of the cover;
- that a Senior Planning officer had mislead the Inspector LGO into believing that the Council's assessment of the plans and drawings was correct.

It appears that Cllr Anglin has understood what I was saying in my email and letter attached of 8-Aug, you should have a copy of each, because he has allowed <u>Alison to respond on his behalf</u>.

The Corporate Lead who has imposed the restrictions referred to in Alison's email says there is no evidence of the Council misinforming the LGO but there are some quite serious ones and if you look at the findings of the second LGO Inspector he only says I'm too late in complaining, not that the first Inspector had been misinformed.

At the end of the day there are only 2 approved drawings giving the planned height of the cover and it is not what the Council are saying. The council say the road end has a planned height of 15.5m but approved drawings give one of 2.7m less. Cllr Anglin has not done himself, nor any of the other Councillors, a favour by ignoring this and the other misdoings of the Council's Panning staff.

What did UK docks have to say for themselves when Emma went to see them?

Kind regards,

Michael