

----- Forwarded message from mick.dawson@theharbourview.co.uk -----

Date: Thu, 16 Jan 2020 09:53:32 +0000

From: mick.dawson@theharbourview.co.uk

Subject: Fwd: Correspondence with the Office of Emma Lewell-Buck

To: "BUCK, Simon" <simon.buck@parliament.uk>, Keith Palmer <palmerk@parliament.uk>

Cc: Cllr Angela Hamilton, Cllr David Francis, Cllr Anglin, Nicola Robason, Hayley Johnson, Alison Hoy

Attachment: [ToAH27Mar19part1.pdf](#)

Dear Sirs,

I can confirm that UK Docks did not submit an application for the Council for retrospective planning and the email I sent to Councillor Hamilton I have copied to a PDF file and attached it. She may be able to help you with the legal points you wish to raise.

I have a dispute with Mrs Johnson about the misinformation/misrepresentation given to the Local Government Ombudsman. I agree with Mr Tilbury of Peter Dunn & co but she maintains that there is no evidence of any. I sent you both a copy of his advice yesterday because Mr Palmer alluded to vexatious communications.

He also suggested I sought legal advice but I had already done so. It looks to me like it was probably criminal fraud for UK Docks to convince the Council that they were building their shed to a set of approved plans when they were not and I was advised that the Police would take no action because they would say it was a Planning Matter.

UK Docks have not done themselves any favours by telling people that they have permission for their shed when they haven't.. It looks to me like they have been breaking the law since March 2014 when they took the Port of Tyne Tug onto the slipway and the Council have been complicit in this.

It was Director of UK Docks who decided to move his business the River Drive and he only had permission for a shed 22m long and it is now 27.5m long which is probably the main reason we were told he had been given permission for it by the Council.

I'll leave it with you for the time being.

M Dawson

----- Forwarded message from mick.dawson@theharbourview.co.uk -----

Date: Wed, 15 Jan 2020 08:52:37 +0000

From: mick.dawson@theharbourview.co.uk

Subject: Re: Correspondence with the Office of Emma Lewell-Buck

To: "BUCK, Simon" <simon.buck@parliament.uk>

Cc: Keith Palmer <palmerk@parliament.uk>, Cllr Angela Hamilton, Cllr David Francis, Hayley Johnson, Customer Advocates

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 misled 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 misled 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