

Dear Mr Harlow,

Evidence to Back Trail of Deceit

My combined email/letter of the 25th September had been incorrectly titled SDCandC-Petition, it has now been posted to the website as STCandC-Petition. You did respond within a few minutes but it was not to correct my error but to complain that I had annoyed you.

I believe thanking you for letting me know from where Mr Simon Buck got the idea to falsely accuse me of making vexatious calls to an MP's office, was not harassment but a rather generous thank you:- *"Thank you for making me look again at the process by which the South Tyneside Council misuse their own Complaints Procedure to hide malpractice of their planning staff and their manager.*

I concede that I was being somewhat disingenuous because I reported that you had made the comment, *Will you just give it a rest mate!*, [against a website Post rather than a Page](#) because comments are not normally made against pages in WordPress.

[I have also taken the opportunity to correct some of the other minor mistakes](#) made in post, STC and Corruption – Petition.

I have no intention of giving it a rest until South Tyneside Council (STC) accept that I was correct when I [complained in January 2014 that the slipway enclosure](#) (shed) built by UK Docks on their slipway off River Drive is nearly 3m taller than planned. Unless one works there or derives some income from it, what is done about the shed is not important but as long as it remains, [it is a symbol of the corruption that is endemic within STC.](#)

It appears that you were attempting to present yourself as Mr Buck by using the email address of simonwrs@gmail.com against a page where I describe how he threatened me with the misuse of a Parliamentary Code. Maybe you did not know that the disgraced Mr Buck should be keeping his head down he after he had falsely accused me of flouting of parliamentary rules but it now appears that you did by making the one word comment YAWN against the post, [Contact Restrictions Review on May 12th.](#)

You were not to know that he had [removed the email shown below from the MP for South Shields inbox](#) which is probably a prosecutable offence.

Re: Complaint: 248789 – Unplanned Development on River Drive
Date: 13/01/2020 (22:05:29 BST)
From: mick.dawson@theharbourview.co.uk
To: Emma Lewell-Buck MP
Cc: Keith Palmer, Cllr Angela Hamilton, Cllr David Francis, Cllr Anglin

[Attachment: 8DLL.pdf \(108 KB\)](#)

Dear Emma,

I answered a call today from a [Mr Keith Palmer on 01914271240](#) and we spoke about UK Docks. Judging from the email address he gave me, I guess he must be your office manager in South Shields and from our conversation I gathered he did not wish to consider any further correspondence from me and suggested that because I now lived away you/he would not be able to deal with correspondence because of parliamentary rules. . .

Please note that the copy of the letter from Peter Dunn and Co was sent to Emma and not to Mr Buck. Nor was it copied to Mr Buck yet it was he [who responded to the second email](#), sent to Emma early on the 14th:-

Dear Emma,

I gave my phone details to your partner to pass to a Mr Keith Parmer, he has them and I spoke to him yesterday on 0191 4271240. Is it safe to assume he is your Office Manager in South Shields and we should write to him on any issues we have with UK Docks? I am Michael David James Dawson etc.

It would appear that Mr Buck had deleted my email of the 13th and its attachment.

From: "BUCK, Simon" <simon.buck@parliament.uk>
To: "mick.dawson@theharbourview.co.uk"
Date: Tue, 14 Jan 2020 14:37:06 +0000
Subject: Correspondence with the Office of Emma Lewell-Buck

Dear Mr Dawson,

Thank you for your email sent this morning following from Mr Palmer's telephone conversation to you yesterday afternoon.

I wish to address two points you raised. I was present during the conversation between Mr Palmer and yourself. I am afraid your recollection of the conversation was not a true account. Mr Palmer was polite, informative and accurate.

Mr Palmer correctly informed you that MPs have no influence over the Local Government Ombudsman, and he suggested that a possible course of action may be to complain further to the Local Government Ombudsman and suggested you take legal advice.

Finally, your suggestion that Mr Palmer, or any other staff member for that matter has been "warned off helping" Emma "by an official at the Town Hall" and then making references to the CLP trying to deselect Emma, is not only untrue but an unwarranted accusation. Your email seriously undermines Mr Palmer's, Emma's and the Office's integrity and it is a very serious matter. I am very sorry that Emma is unable to help you further with this case and I consider this matter to be closed.

Simon Buck

Office Manager for the Office of Emma Lewell-Buck MP

I had sent Emma a copy of the solicitor's letter because Mr Palmer had suggested that I sought legal advice and I read that the Constituency Labour Party (CLP) had attempted to deselect her. Emma was in fact one of five MPs being deselected prior to the election in 2019 and there were [articles about it in the National Press](#) so one is entitled to ask, why on earth was Mr Buck contradicting me.

Note that he wished the matter to be closed and that he was not the first. He was in fact one of many and my records show that a [Principal Planning Officer in 2013 was one of the first](#):- *"this is the end of the matter as far as I am concerned. . Please do not email me again*

I had given [Mr Buck my home phone number on condition](#) that Mr Palmer and I talk about corruption and UK Docks' shed:-

Dear Simon,

Sorry, I do not look in my mail every day and it may be better to use my personal email box daw50nmdj@hotmail.co.uk unless Keith wants to talk about corruption at the Town Hall, UK Docks etc.

A message was left on my phone at home the following Monday to ring Emma's office and I returned the call quite late on the 13th January 2020. It became clear during that call, that UK

Docks and corruption was the last thing that Mr Palmer wished to talk about. Evidence that he had taken sides with those on the Council who claimed that UK Docks had permission for their shed. More importantly Mr Palmer appeared to have taken sides with those who had been bullying Emma [since she had become an MP](#).

As you can see from the extract of the email of the 14th, published above, it became clear that Mr Buck had also sided with both UK Docks those on South Tyneside Council who had [been bullying the MP for a number of years](#) and it appears that the bullying was extended to an attempt at deselection of her by CLP but she was saved by Mr Rees-Mogg and the PM calling an early election to *Get Brexit Done*.

It appears that the bullying had come from very top because in November 2020 the [Leader Iain Malcolm later resigned in disgrace for bullying staff](#) but what is more significant was the Chief Executive, Mr Martin Swales, had handed in his resignation six weeks earlier, possibly to avoid being associated with doomed Leader of the Council.

Both, the bullying of the MP in late 2019 and the departure Messrs Swales and Malcolm were reported by the Gazette in late 2020 but the articles are no longer available so I had to refer elsewhere for evidence [that the Chief Executive had also left under a cloud](#). When I lived in South Shields I used to get Gazette copies but now I live in Amble that option is no longer available.

While Councillor A Hamilton does not talk of being bullied it is hard to read this without coming to the conclusion that she also has been [bullied since she became a Labour Councillor in 2018](#):- *“Two weeks after I was elected, a colleague compared me in derogatory terms to a dead councillor.*

When you made the comment, *give it a rest mate*, against the page about vexatious complaints, I believe that it was made on behalf of those stood to lose most by the truth about the shed being revealed and wrote to council officer who had instructed Ms Abbott to revive the misuse of a staff code, Complaints Policy 2019v1.5.

I informed her on 2nd May 2023, that I would not give it a rest until it was admitted that UK Docks' shed is was taller than planned and the other Local Residents and I had been right about its height since since September 2013.

After your request to give it a rest in April 2023:-

[One Response to Threat: Simon Buck, 26-Feb-20](#)

Simon (simonwrs@gmail.com) says:

April 13, 2023 at 04:26

Will you just give it a rest mate!

I did a bit of research and that led me back to the Council's [Standards Committee meeting of 6th July, 2018](#) were in response to a question from Cllr Doreen Purvis, the legal chief said:-

“The [complaints] process itself provides for complaints or communications, that are described as being complaints but mainly aren't, to be rejected fairly early on if they're considered to be tit for tat, politically motivated or 'vexatious',” Interim Head of Legal Services, John Rumney, said.

In the same article, 28-Feb-19, author: C Binding; reported that the Interim Head of Legal Services went on to say:- *“Whether it’s possible to go back beyond the beginning of this year or late 2019 I’m not sure that the records will be there I’m afraid.”*

It looks like Mr Rumney was giving his blessing for the removal of evidence of any correspondence that could incriminate building inspectors, planning officers and their managers etc. from 2013 up to late 2019 and that includes giving misinformation/misrepresentation to Local Government Ombudsman to hide the fact that a senior planning officer lied [when he claimed that UK Docks had approval for the shed we see today](#).

The truly disturbing thing about this episode is that if one tries to reference the Gazette article of 28th February 2019 one will fail because the publication date has been moved from its original date from nearly a year before my altercation with Messrs Buck and Palmer to the 7th July 2020, some six months after it.

When I picked up the reference to the meeting from the article in the [Gazette: Published 28th Feb 2019, 14:03 GMT- 4 min read](#), one would conclude that it referred to the meeting had been held in July 2018 rather than July 2019. The situation has been confused by someone requesting a change to the publication date from February 2019 to July 2020.

It now appears that Mr Buck had been prompted to accuse me of vexatious behaviour by Mr K Palmer as a result of the meeting in February 2019 which included Cllr D Purvis who was Council Leader and Mr J Rumney, Corporate Lead, Legal & Governance at South Tyneside Council.

[I started my Shed and Corruption Series in March 2021](#) and it was based on the timeline that I had shared with my neighbours and the Council since we first noticed that Building Control were operating to standards depending who they were dealing with rather than with what they were supposed to be dealing.

Within a month of the [issue of the Second Part of the Series in April 2021](#) the Council reintroduced the practice first put in place in 2016, late so that they need not answer questions relating to the Freedom of Information Act 2000 and more especially about the planned height of the shed.

[It was based on the misuse of Section F of their Staff Code](#) and initiated by the Council’s Corporate Lead, Hayley Johnson, on behalf of the Chief Executive because he did not want to admit that I was correct when I asked on [behalf of the other local residents](#):-

I ask you to look again at this because there is a clear contradiction between what the Council were telling the LGO and what is known. Why your staff should misrepresent the facts to the LGO is for you to determine. That they have misinformed the LGO should be admitted and corrected and that is what this letter is about.

She had said a year earlier [in an attachment to a letter to the MP for Berwick](#), 25th June 2015:-

The matters and allegations raised by your constituent are well documented and have been subject to a number of enquiries from Mr Dawson and other local residents over a lengthy period of time. The matter was ultimately referred by way of complaint to the Local Government Ombudsman, the outcome of which was delivered on 14 April 2015.

The lengthy period of time began when we first enquired about the height of the shed in September 2013 and were told on September the 5th by the Principal Planning Officer, Mr P Cunningham:- *This development was approved by the Tyne and Wear Development Corporation.*

As I've repeatedly said, since March 2014, what we see today on the slipway managed by UK Docks [was not approved by the Corporation](#) and since then one has the choice of agreeing with Mr Cunningham, or with the local residents and I. A binary choice, with the lie that UK Docks have permission for their shed or the truth, which is that they have not.

That you describe theharbourview.co.uk as *Yet Another Waste of Net-space*, puts you among those who back his view rather than the view of those who claim perfectly reasonably that the shed had never been approved.

Everything to do with UK Docks is and their shed is now swept under the carpet by [Monitoring Officer, Nicola Robason when she declares](#):- *"It remains the case that all complaints procedures relating to this matter have been exhausted both internally within the Council and externally"*.

She is hiding the fact that two Councillors, two people with an interest in UK Docks and the Principal Planning Officer [decided at a meeting, 25-Nov-13](#), to turn a blind eye to the fact that UK Docks did not have permission for their slipway shed.

She was also hiding the following:-

1. that the Principal Planning Officer claimed that the shed had been [approved by referring back to a meeting, 25-Nov-13, we had been told that the shed was legal](#);
2. that the Planning Manager backed the lie, 15-Jan-14, [that UK Docks had approval for their shed](#);
3. that the [Head of Development Services, Mr G Mansbridge, backed his planning officers](#);
4. the same Council Officer held a meeting, 8-Jul-14, [to examine an approved drawing of UK Docks but it was not produced](#);
5. that a [Senior Planning Officer gave misinformation/misrepresentation to the Local Government Ombudsman](#);
6. that a Corporate Lead lied to an MP when [she said the 5 items above were allegations](#);
7. [that the Second Inspector for the Ombudsman conflated](#) the complaint that the shed was taller than planned with the complaint that the Council had misled the first Ombudsman.

I hope you agree with me that the sixth item on the list was almost offensive as Mr Mansbridge overwritten the history of the first four items [with with one in which he claimed the shed had approval](#):-

If you require any further information in relation to this matter you may contact George Mansbridge, Head of Development Services on 0191 424 7566.

For a brief period, less than 2 weeks, it appeared that the Monitoring had changed her mind and decided that all the complaints procedures had not been exhausted internally because very late in 2020 I received what I now call [the broken promise from Leah Smith on behalf of Nicola](#):-

Dear Mr Dawson

Thank you for your email regarding complaints you have raised with the Council.

I am writing to acknowledge receipt and confirm that this matter will be looked into and you will receive a response week commencing 4th January.

Regards

Leah

I believed that I was going to get something comparable to the admission made by the Planning Manager in February 2014 when he agreed with me that the shed was indeed nearly [3m taller than planned and I promptly thanked her:-](#)

Dear Leah,

Thank you for responding on Nicola's behalf.

On reading back through the email this morning I realised that I should have asked Nicola to pass a copy of it to John Rumney as there are some serious legal points to be gone over before Nicola even considers her response.

The serious legal points were raised in the attached signed letter, [Conflation of Complaints](#) and for this reason it was copied to Mr J Rumney, Corporate Lead Legal & Governance at STC.

My optimism was short lived as I received no response in the week commencing 4th January nor anything from the Council [until I received a Contact Restrictions Letter](#) from the Performance and Information Team nearly four months.

They said that the contact restrictions which had been lifted on the 28th August 2018 were to be reimposed because those in control of the Council in April 2021, Cllr Dixon and J Rumney, saw which way my exploration or our shared time line was heading and [did not wish for the truth about the shed's height to be revealed.](#)

When the approved documents from 1996 were recovered in September 2013 they would have shown that the shed was nearly 3m taller than permitted and STC forced UK Docks to stop work on their shed which [effectively closed the boat or shipyard from 23rd, see page 2.](#)

[At the meeting of 25-Nov-13, Cllr Anglin, by saying the shed was legal,](#) was implying that the shed had approval but it did not have approval and both the Principal Planning Officer and I knew that. He let it go and I was not given the opportunity to question the Councillor about it. Work restarted on the shed within days of the meeting.

When the big cranes arrived in the yard to lift the overhead crane I decided enough was enough and put in a formal complaint, 10-Jan-14, which left them in a fix because I raised the question:- *As the applicant has not discharged condition 2 why is there no retrospective planning application?*

The first response was from the Principal Planning Office, Mr Cunningham, who referred me back to the meeting of the 25th November where we had been told that UK Docks had discharged the second condition and that left the Planning Manager, Mr Atkinson, in a very bad place because he knew as well as I did that UK Docks had not discharged 2nd condition.

What I did not know but he knew was that he would never have to defend Mr Cunningham's reprehensible actions in a Court of Law and instead of shutting down UK Docks works and reprimanding his Principal Planning Officer he chose to set up the trail of deceit by claiming that UK Docks had approval for their shed in January 2014 and ended with [you asking me to give it a rest in April 2023.](#)

It looks like Mr Buck had been requisitioned to claim that I had been making vexatious emails or calls and thank you again, though it may not have been your intention, for uncovering the fact that it was most likely to have been either or both, the Leader of the Council or his Interim Head of Legal Services, who in early 2020 who had persuaded Mr Buck to act as he did.

Your sincerely
Michael Dawson