

Fwd: Conduct of South Tyneside Council
From: mick.dawson@theharbourview.co.uk
Date: 24/02/2020 (04:49:52 PM GMT)
To: Simon Buck
Cc: Keith Palmer, Emma Lewell-Buck MP, Cllr Angela Hamilton, Cllr David Francis, Nicola Robason, Stuart Wright, George Mansbridge, Hayley Johnson
Bcc: 20 or so local residents

4 Attachments:

[Frames11sep13.jpg](#) put two chalk marks on the railings, go 13m to the right and repeat.

[Detail river end 1B.jpg](#) - from the first set of drawings provided by UK Docks.

[D8296 14.pdf](#) no-one has disputed the size but they have said the gable is not to scale and refers to the uphill end which is ridiculous because the boats come up into the shed from the river.

[D8296 2.pdf](#) - Notice it is authorised- [the first copy of this drawing had the sizes missing](#).

Dear Simon,

I wrote to you on the 24th January thanking you for removing the block from mick dawson at theharbourview.co.uk so that my copy to Emma did not bounce from her mailbox at parliament.uk. I notice that it has been reinstated, 20-Feb-20 and it is likely she will not have seen the email nor the two attachments, '[Destroying Evidence](#)' and '[Dishonesty at the Town Hall](#)'. I have not attached them to this email to you as Mr Parker will be able to forward a copy of my email and attachments to both you and Emma when he returns to work today the 24th.

The reason they have not been attached is because the others (30 not counting Emma) on the circulation lists will have already seen them. I have attached the two missing items and the first thing to note about them is the difference in the planned section and the section we now see. The Planning Manager at the time said it was not material but he was wrong as the extra room at the height of the hip in the mansard allowed the fitting of the overhead crane and that was not in the plans approved by the authority in 1996.

I have also decided to attach a copy of the drawing, 8296/14, I sent to planning when I complained about the lack of building control in January 2014 and 8296/2 as the new evidence that Mr Parker as good as demanded over the phone a few weeks ago.

The observant will notice the height to the hip is missing from the detail, it should be 12.5m, making the planned river end height 15.5m and therefore the landward end 12.8m when the gradient of 2.7m is taken into account, and [not as 15.5m as claimed by UK Docks and the Council](#). This was from the early copies of the drawing 1B first sent out by the Council. Later copies of 1A did show the height but by then I had decided to use 8296/14 as it had been approved by the Council in October 2013. It is the annotated copy sent to Planning in January 2014 and later to the Ombudsman. Whatever planning tell you the gable is clearly the river end and therefore the other end would be about 12 and a half meters in height.

I now draw your attention to the last attachment 8296/2 and its significance cannot be underestimated as it is the only approved drawing from 1966 in the Council's possession with a dimension. If you and Mr Palmer take a look you will see the height of the roof is 16.1 or 0.3m above the datum and that is 0.6m below the footings, so needs to be subtracted, leaving 12.5 or 12.7m for the approved height at the landward end.

Over the week end I have reposted my comments on the [Ombudsman's finding for paras 19-23 and paras 30-38 you will see that a Senior Planning officer from South Tyneside Council has told her something rather different](#) and I quote from 38:

/This developer applied for a shed 15.5 metres high at the land end. The Tyne and Wear Development Corporation as planning authority approved this./

This was very clearly a lie and is one of the bits of misinformation/misrepresentation given to the Ombudsman in 2015 and was still being repeated in a letter from Council Solicitor excusing Cllr Anglin's conduct as late as 2018.

[The first time this piece of misinformation saw the light of day was on the 15th of January 2014:](#)

/Approved Drawings...The drawing that was submitted on 11th April 1996 with the application is numbered 8296/1A. That shows the overall height of the structure as 15.5m above the foundation level at the landward end. /

Planning Manager, South Tyneside Council

When I complained to the Chief Executive about his staff misleading the Ombudsman I used it as an example but [the reply on his behalf said that there was no evidence](#) of the Council giving misinformation deliberately, and they have been using that lie to close down any conversation since 1-Aug-16. I received a similar reply when I explained the same misrepresentation in a different way to the Corporate Lead, Mrs Hayley Johnson and since October 2016 they have made sure that the enforcement was extended to cover the Second Phase of the Development, Sunday Working and complaints about the way staff have been handling the complaints.

With a similar method apparently put back by Mr Parker to block my correspondence with Emma it appears that he is copying the technique employed by Mrs Johnson and I hope it was just coincidence, otherwise I can justly accuse them both of working for the same paymaster.

I have yet to broach Sunday working and the Second Phase with Emma, both of which occurred after the Ombudsman's report of the 15th April 2015 and I really could do without an argument with Mr Parker every time I wish to set up a line of communication about anything to do with UK Docks.

I did notice while I was updating/correcting my views on the Ombudsman's findings #35 I'm reported as saying, a report does not specify which end is 15.5 metres and may of alluded to it but told her in no uncertain terms which end had a planned height of 15.5m – see my comments on 8296/2 above.

I hope I have established the fact that the shed is nearly 3m taller than planned but UK Docks told Angela and presumably Emma that the had been given permission for it retrospectively and we now know that not to be true. I think it was because UK Docks were asked to produce any approved plans that backed their view. They could not because there are none and that is why they span the yarn about retrospective plans.

I should have done that years ago instead of plodding through a rigged complaints procedure but here is a nice twist. The [complaints procedure should have been brought to a halt in February 2014](#) and the breaches in planning control attended to but the need to drive it along to the Ombudsman was compulsive. It is the 'method' of covering up malpractice etc.

The Head of Development Services therefore had to invent a second or third stage escalation provided by me and his did this by closing down the supposed original complaint and opening a new [i.e. deleting 248789 and replacing it with a response to a fictional escalation to start 253539](#).

I know I never wrote one because there was no need and you can confirm what I am saying by asking Mr Mansbridge to provide a copy and see what he comes up with.

Better still – ask Mr Palmer to do it and note that I hope to return to the less divisive dealings I had with Emma's Office up to last summer.

Yours sincerely
Michael Dawson

