

RE: Boat Repair Shelter, Tyne Slipway (Uk Docks)
ATKINSON, Rebecca <rebecca.atkinson@parliament.uk>
Thu 15/06/2017 11:24

Hi Michael

Thanks for this. Once you have a response from the council please do let us know.

Best wishes

Rebecca

From: Michael Dawson [mailto:daw50nmdj@hotmail.co.uk]
Sent: 27 May 2017 07:43
To: ATKINSON, Rebecca <rebecca.atkinson@parliament.uk>
Cc: KNIGHT, Emily <emily.knight@parliament.uk>
Subject: Boat Repair Shelter, Tyne Slipway (Uk Docks)

Dear Rebecca,

I have attached a copy of my letter which I delivered to the Chief Executive yesterday about the conduct of Hayley Johnson, the Council's Corporate Lead, and a Planning Officer which I think is self explanatory.

You will see I wrote the reminder to Anne Marie a year and a half ago about this because I lived in Amble at that time.

I thought that in accepting the proposals to extend the shelter, the Council were hiding the fact that it was built without permission. As predicted, permission to extend the shelter was granted and work has started in the last week or so on the redevelopment of the site so I have taken the opportunity to write to the CEO about the conduct of his staff.

I'm copying my letter to Emily because I hope to move back to Amble in the near future and I want to set things right between myself and Anne-Marie. Parliamentary rules may mean that Emily might be dealing with this rather than you.

Please pass on my best wishes to Emma and Anne-Marie respectively.

I'll let both of you know of the response.

Yours sincerely,

Michael Dawson

From: Michael Dawson (daw50nmdj@hotmail.co.uk)
Sent: 30 October 2015 16:08:16
To: Anne-Marie Trevelyan MP (annemarie.trevelyan.mp@parliament.uk)
Cc: Emily J Knight (emilyj.knight@parliament.uk)

Dear Anne-Marie Trevelyan

It is nearly five months since you wrote to the CEO of South Tyneside Council on my behalf about the Boat Shelter on Tyne Slipway being built without, in the Council's own words, planning

permission.

It is also six weeks since I sent an email to your Office Manager asking if Mr Swales had replied. However I have had no response.

It would appear, if he has not written to you yet, that I can only assume he is condoning the irregular planning practises of his staff. The residents did raise a Petition with 300 signatories about this.

It would also appear that the Council are trying to hide the fact that the shelter has been built too high by accepting an application to extend it, as well as adding another shelter and extending the office block to the boatyard.

It also confirms my suspicions that the Planning Office are unable to provide the CEO with any dated and approved plans that show that the shelter has not been built 3m higher than planned.

However, to get to the point, you wrote:

"Mr Dawson maintains that the shelter is not appropriately located and is clearly concerned that planning conditions are being ignored and are not being enforced by the Council and I would be grateful to receive your views on this matter, so that I can report back to my constituent"

Are you able to report yet?

yours sincerely

Michael Dawson

ATKINSON, Rebecca

Automatic reply: Boat Repair Shelter, Tyne Slipway (Uk Docks)

27/05/2017

Parliament has now been dissolved until the General Election. Therefore there are currently no Members of Parliament. Incoming emails to this account may be received and read, however this email address is only being used to respond to urgent constituency

ATKINSON, Rebecca

Automatic reply: Non Compliance and Sunday Working, UK Docks, River Drive.

07/04/2017

Thank you for your email. I am now on annual leave and will return to work on Tuesday 18th April 2017. If your enquiry is urgent then please contact the constituency office on 0191 4271240. Best wishes, Rebecca Atkinson (Office Manager to Emma L

ATKINSON, Rebecca

RE: Conduct of the Case Officer – Mr P Cunningham

29/03/2017

Hi Michael Thanks for this. Emma has a meeting with UK Docks this Friday, once we have spoken with them and collated all of the information then we will be in touch further with next steps. Best wishes Rebecca

ATKINSON, Rebecca<rebecca.atkinson@parliament.uk>

Fri 17/03/2017 12:20

Hi Michael

Thank you for letting me know.

Best wishes

Rebecca

From: Michael Dawson [mailto:daw50nmdj@hotmail.co.uk]
Sent: 17 March 2017 12:18
To: ATKINSON, Rebecca <rebecca.atkinson@parliament.uk>
Subject: Fw: UK Docks - Early Days - Part 2 and the LGO

Dear Rebecca,

Paul did a lot of the early work on this and supported me when I first set up 'theharbourview'. I find it useful to try and explain to him what I am doing and that is why I have forwarded it to you. 'Conduct of STC Management – Job No 253539' is on the stocks and I hope to finish it over the week end.

Kind regards,
Michael

From: Michael Dawson <daw50nmdj@hotmail.co.uk>
Sent: 17 March 2017 11:56
To: HEPBURN SEN P
Subject: Re: UK Docks - Early Days - Part 2 and the LGO

Hi Paul,

I've been to consult a solicitor, £250 so far, and he says the best path I can take is to show that the Council have misinformed the LGO but the difficulty is that the Council use the LGO as the 4th Stage in their complaints as I said before.

The Inspector for the LGO had already made her mind up after speaking to the Council about my complaint and ignored the representation I made about the plans to try and correct things. The analysis ([copy sent earlier](#)) says the same thing as I said to the LGO but much more clearly.

The point I made about the drawings last Tuesday still stands:-

I hope you agree that they show that the claim that the shed is compliant in respect of height is fraudulent. It looks like the plans given to Mr Cunningham were intended to deceive but the drawing submitted by the agents for approval was sound.

The Police will not prosecute because it is a planning matter and the cost of a civil action is prohibitive, we may not get the result we want and we may be stuck with a huge bill.

Thanks for the support. With a bit of persistence, and luck maybe, we'll make it impossible for UK Docks to expand the boat yard into a ship yard.

Cheers Mick

From: HEPBURN SEN P <hepburnsenp@btinternet.com>
Sent: 16 March 2017 17:15
To: Michael Dawson
Subject: Re: UK Docks - Early Days - Part 2 and the LGO

Mick

Though I have no particular axe to grind with ELB and in fact found meeting her very pleasant, she still has to rely on the Council to support her MP job. I feel she will find it difficult to start upsetting what I would call her employers (my crude way of putting it.)

As for taking it to the newspapers - though it may be the ultimate threat - I am not sure what support you could expect from the Shields Gazette. Again I feel it might want to stay on the Councils good side and there might be some collusion between both bodies.

I agree with your comments re Port of Tyne and it makes UK Docks appear to have quite a strong hand.

I often wonder if we had went up the path of hiring some legal eagle would we have been any better off? As far as I see it they would have used all the information YOU had collected as the basis of a case and still the Council and the Ombudsman would have ignored them.

Paul H

On Thursday, 16 March 2017, 10:59, Michael Dawson <daw50nmdj@hotmail.co.uk> wrote:

Hi Paul

Yes, we can appeal to our MP - Emma Lewell-Buck.

Rebecca is Emma's office manager and I think she is on the ball. We agreed over the phone that I would sort out and send her all the stuff that I have and she can pick through it and we can decide where to go from there.

I've got the ultimate threat of taking it to the Newspapers but I don't want to go down that road as they may just use it to bash the labour party or twist it round to jobs being put at risk, which is irrelevant. They have to maintain ferries, pilot boats and Border Agency patrol boats and UK Docks have the monopoly for this in the NE which is not a healthy state of affairs and it looks to me like they are abusing the situation.

It's also complicated by the fact the Port of Tyne would not like their pilot boats to have to go to the Wear to be maintained. No pilot boats = no Port of Tyne.

Mr Cunningham was under a lot of pressure to get this through quickly because the Port of Tyne wanted to close off UK Docks existing slipway off Commercial Road and a retrospective planning application would have made proper plans necessary. It was made very clear during the original planning application that they could have the enclosure but there was to be no further expansion of the yard. Certainly not to include a shed with a travelling crane.

After his boss conceded to me that it was too high the Council should have met with us to compromise and probably got rid of Mr Cunningham so he could not cause any more trouble.

Oh what a tangled web we weave, when we first practice to deceive.

Cheers Mick

From:HEPBURN SEN P <hepburnsenp@btinternet.com>

Sent:15 March 2017 23:47

To:Michael Dawson

Subject:Re: UK Docks - Early Days - Part 2 and the LGO

Mike

Is here anyone higher than the ombudsman that an appeal can be made too?

Paul H

On Wednesday, 15 March 2017, 14:27, Michael Dawson <daw50nmdj@hotmail.co.uk> wrote:

Dear Rebecca,

Paul has nailed it when he says he cannot see the ombudsman taking our side after they let the existing mistakes get past. The Council appear to be using them a 4th Stage in their Complaints Procedure.

I explained to the Local Government Ombudsman (LGO) in some detail why the drawings sent to them by the Council were not valid but they did not listen. They took more notice of the misrepresentations sent to them by the Council than what the actual drawings were conveying.

These are the misrepresentations created by the Planning Manager back in 2014 when he was still saying the enclosure was compliant: the ones outlined in my last email to you.

When I raised the issue of the Planning Office misinforming the LGO with the Chief Executive, I was told the Council considered the matter closed. I have reminded them that I do not consider the case closed until they provide us with any approved drawing to show that their view of the planned height of the enclosure is valid.

They cannot provide one and many people beside me have asked.

Kind regards,

Michael

From:HEPBURN SEN P <hepburnsenp@btinternet.com>

Sent:14 March 2017 11:18

To:Michael Dawson

Subject:Re: UK Docks - Early Days - Part 2

Mick

Again let me congratulate you on your research. I can only imagine the amount of time you have taken to gather the information.

What is your opinion on how effective the information will be in bringing about changes. By rights changes should be made based on how the Council has acted when persons making domestic house changes have not worked to plan.

Like I have voiced in the past the Council and local councillors do not regard the complaints or opinions of the public to be of any importance and feel they can steam-roller there decisions through. In the course of doing that they throw mud at any contrary opinions by stating that such

details are unimportant or just original suggestions. It is only by stating the amount of detail you have discovered that there might be the possibility of a change.

I cannot see the ombudsman taking our side after he let the existing mistakes get past.

Paul H

On Tuesday, 14 March 2017, 8:04, Michael Dawson <daw50nmdj@hotmail.co.uk> wrote:

Hi again,

Here is a copy of my analysis of the plans and drawings obtained from the Council. It will be used to explain my problems with the Council to our MP.

I hope you agree that they show that the claim that the shed is compliant in respect of height is fraudulent. It looks like the plans given to Mr Cunningham were intended to deceive but the drawing submitted by the agents for approval was sound.

Julie pointed out to me, quite rightly, that it is dangerous to make any form of accusation without robust evidence so I've just stuck to what the drawings actually tell us and this is that the shed has been built 2.7m higher than planned.

Cheers

Mick

UK Parliament Disclaimer: This e-mail is confidential to the intended recipient. If you have received it in error, please notify the sender and delete it from your system. Any unauthorised use, disclosure, or copying is not permitted. This e-mail has been checked for viruses, but no liability is accepted for any damage caused by any virus transmitted by this e-mail. This e-mail address is not secure, is not encrypted and should not be used for sensitive data.

ATKINSON, Rebecca <rebecca.atkinson@parliament.uk>
Wed 25/01/2017 12:30

Hi Michael

Thanks for getting in touch.

We aware of the issues with the Gazette and have been in contact with them over similar comments and issues, but thank you for drawing this to our attention.

Please do pass on any further information about UK Docks and we can see what route is then open to Emma to take this forward on your behalf.

Very best wishes

Rebecca

Office Manager to Emma Lewell-Buck MP
Member of Parliament for South Shields

ATKINSON, Rebecca
UK Docks
26/10/2016

Dear Michael Thank you for the emails that you have sent to Emma in relation to the above issue. Would it be possible for you to contact the office tomorrow in order to speak with me about this issue and so that we can clarify the next steps to take