

I pointed out to the meeting that the drawing 8296/1A showed both ends of the shed to be 15.5m and it looks like Mr Atkinson is attempting to cover his back – see below. When he says “When read in conjunction with the drawing (8296/1A) it must refer to the inland end” he could equally well have said that it must refer to the river end. The latter view is, as has been shown, the one which does not contradict 8296/14. Jonathan Wilson was responsible for presenting the drawing 8296/1B (1997 version of 1A) to Mr Cunningham in early September which deceived the Council into thinking that UK Docks were building to an approved plan. The agents Maughan Reynolds and Partners had drawn 8296/14 to meet condition 4 and this was approved by the Council in October 2014. It gives a river end of 15.6 or 16m which resolved the issue of which end in 8296/1A or 1B had a planned height of 15.5m and it was not the road end.

From: Gordon Atkinson  
To: mick.dawson@theharbourview.co.uk  
Cc: George Mansbridge; Ian Rutherford  
Sent: Wednesday, July 09, 2014 12:34 PM  
Subject: UK Docks [NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED]

Dear Mr Dawson

Further to our meeting yesterday, I have gone through the disc and found the TWDC report from 1996, and now attach a copy. The only reference to the dimensions are in the paragraph I have highlighted on page 1. The height is said to be ‘approximately 15.5 m high’-I accept that there is no reference to whether this is the inland end, or the riverside end, but when read in conjunction with the drawing (8296/1A) it must refer to the inland end. There is no reference in the report to the height (or indeed any other dimension) of the proposal having been amended in the period between submission and approval by the TWDC. There is a reference (highlighted) on p2 which refers to amended plans but I believe this can only be to 8296/4 which introduced the windows as it is in the context of photomontages illustrating a solid structure. I have also spoken to Jonathon Wilson who confirms that the dimensions of the proposal were not altered during the assessment of the proposal.

Regards  
Gordon Atkinson