

Re: Correspondence with the Office of Emma Lewell-Buck

From: mick.dawson@theharbourview.co.uk

Date: 15/01/2020 (08:52:37 AM GMT)

To: BUCK, Simon

Cc: Keith Palmer, Cllr Angela Hamilton, Cllr David Francis, Hayley Johnson, Customer Advocates

4 Attachments

[application/pdf] DishonestyatTH-Emma30Oct19.pdf (31 KB)

[application/pdf] 8DLL.pdf (108 KB)

[application/pdf] toELB20Oct16.pdf (77 KB)

[application/pdf] Donottalkabouttheheight.pdf (28 KB)

Message Log: You forwarded this message on 16/01/2020 09:53:32 AM to: "BUCK, Simon", Keith Palmer, Cllr Angela Hamilton, Cllr David Francis, Cllr Anglin, Nicola Robason, Hayley Johnson, Alison Hoy.

Dear Mr Buck,

As far as I remember Mr Palmer was indeed polite and I hope you thought I was as well. Whether he was accurate is another matter. It would have been courteous for Mr Palmer to have introduced himself. I assumed that when I gave you permission to pass my home phone number to him he had become Emma's new office manager after her re-election. Please see trail below. He very obviously let me assume I was talking her new Office Manager. He did not inform me that you, her actual office manager was listening in. Please let me have any copy of the recording of what was said so that I can check it against the length of my call for any editing.

You will see from the first attachment that the Council have not been honest with either Emma, Angela or myself. You will see from the second attachment that that I have already sought legal advice and Mr Tilbury suggested that we should first ask the Council about misleading the Ombudsman and then approach the Ombudsman and this I did. The Council said they had not mislead the Ombudsman and if you remember I told Mr Palmer that any complaint against the Local Government Ombudsman was was pointless. They just say the complaint remains that of the first complaint.

When you consider the matter closed, do you mean that the Council can cover up wrongdoing by misleading the Ombudsman is OK? Do you think it OK that they can then use the Ombudsman's findings to mislead MPs and other enquirers. Mr Palmer certainly gave me that impression he was implying that over the phone. As you can see from the third attachment the Council have been dishonest with everyone for a long time.

When you consider the matter closed you are only repeating what the Principal Planning Manager said on January 13th 2014 and in the six years the Council have consistently lied about the shed having been approved.

You will see, below, that whatever we said over the phone he mislead me into thinking he was Emma's Office Manager but I see from your email that you are her Office Manager. So who is Mr Palmer? I'm sorry but I cannot help thinking he is dancing to the same tune as those that tried to get Emma deselected.

I have reattached the files i.e. the second and third, that were attached to the notes to Emma, posted below. The fourth is the letter sent to Michaela of Customer Advocacy which was detached from the steam. This was never considered but passed back to the villain of the piece. One of the people mentioned in my email to Emma on 20-Oct-16 and as it is rude to talk about people behind their backs I have copied this to her and Customer Advocates.

By the way Nicola Robason has confirmed that UK Docks did not put in a retrospective planning request which beggars the question: Why did they tell Angela and Emma that they had.

Perhaps your Mr Palmer can answer the question?

Mr Dawson