

Church St  
Amble  
20-July-2022

Dear Emma,

**Messrs Buck and Palmer**

Hopefully this will be the last part in the series though I fear that whoever is in control of South Tyneside Council are secure in the knowledge that the police will not prosecute them and they have plenty of backers to make civil action prohibitively expensive for anybody to take civil action against them so they can sit behind that protective wall and continue to back UK Docks claim that they had approval for their shed.

As I said in my covering email [Mr Buck contacted me on the 8th January](#) and I was suspicious because I had already established contact with your office on Westoe Rd, by calling in and introducing myself in 2017 and was given Rebecca Heath's (nee Atkinson) email address and was more than happy to correspond by that medium as there was never any need to use the phone.

[After reviewing my latest correspondence with your office](#) I thought it worth the risk and gave Simon Buck my personal details which ended with the call made by me on the 13th January from my home to Mr Palmer and as I said in my covering email the last thing he wished to discuss was UK Docks and corruption. Mr Palmer made it very clear that [his agenda was very different to the conditions I had set](#) and that I had been conned by Mr Buck into talking about such serious matters over the phone.

From what I remember Mr Palmer said he was not interested in corruption at the Town Hall and told me that any further correspondence with you will be placed on file without a response under the label of vexatious mail. I had good reason to believe you were at Parliament in London and unlikely to disturb him while on the phone to me from your S. Shields office and I'm sure I would of taken the mickey knowing full well he did not have a leg to stand on. I then [took a few hours to compose a response](#) and took the trouble to send you a copy of the advice I had sought from an independent solicitor because one of Mr Palmer's suggestions was that I consult a solicitor.

Please note, I had copied him and the Ward Councillors but not Mr Buck. I had cooled down overnight and [wrote a much more reasoned response for you in the morning](#) and copied the Monitoring Officer, Nicola Robeson and the Head of Legal Services but it appears that was removed from the records as well as the one of the evening of the 13th.

As I said Mr Palmer had a different agenda and I while I included him in the list of people copied I [deliberately excluded My Buck and yet it was he who replied](#) and let me go through his email to me of the 14th January 2020 point by point:-

Dear Mr Dawson, Thank you for your email sent this morning following from Mr Palmer's telephone conversation to you yesterday afternoon.	
	What happened to the email of the 13th to you with the copy of the letter from Peter Dunn and Co attached? Did you ever see it?
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	
	The implication being that I was offensive and inaccurate but I'll let others decide by examining the contents of both emails for themselves. In particular:-

	<p>13th: I understood from Mr Palmer that this was no longer a matter for Parliament but I think it is. Only Parliament can make it a criminal offence to lie to the Ombudsman. I have attached a copy of the letter from my Solicitor for Mr Palmer's perusal and he would do well to read the email to Customer Advocacy 03 September 2016 at the foot of the trail below.</p> <p>14th: I gave my phone details to you 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?</p>
Mr Palmer correctly informed you that MPs have no influence over the Local Government Ombudsman,	
	I have no argument with that but what were Messrs Buck and Palmer implying by stating something so obvious. To late to get some clarification but it appears to be made as a renunciation of the letter from Peter Dunn and Co – see next line.
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.	
	I had already taken legal advice and it is worth repeating:- What happened to the copy of the advice from Peter Dunn and Co? It was sent to you and Mr Buck writes as if he had no knowledge of its existence. Mr Palmer was advised to take notice of it and also an email where I advised Customer Advocacy of its existence.
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.	
	Mr Buck has selectively lifted that from my email of the 13th, which he failed to acknowledge, my interpretation of the 'news' coming out of South Shield in late 2019 was that some the CLP were acting against you and you were saved by Parliament calling the 'Get Brexit Done' election.
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.	
	Mr Buck may well of wished for the matter to be closed but so did the Planning Officers when faced with evidence that UK Docks' shed was taller than planned.
Simon Buck, Office Manager for the Office of Emma Lewell-Buck MP	

I had forwarded a [copy of my letter to the Council's Corporate Lead of the 2nd September 2016](#) to Customer Advocacy on the 3rd of September because I had advised her that I had taken the trouble to seek legal advice and it appears that this information was not relayed to Customer Advocacy:- *I consulted a solicitor about Ms Hoy's letter because I felt that she was being used by Mr Simmonette to avoid answering the question of the planned height of the shed \* - The Solicitor's view, off the record, was that UK Docks, in saying they were building the shed to approved plans when they were not, was probably criminal fraud but the police were unlikely to act on a planning issue. He also suggested a civil court may not be the best way forward but he did say that in his view we needed to raise a new complaint. The new complaint being the misinformation and/or misrepresentation by the Local Authority in supplying information to the LGO.*

Alison Hoy of Customer Advocacy was still denying the fact [that South Tyneside Council were giving misinformation to the Ombudsman](#) as late as December 2017. Before I get back to Mr Buck's rather jaundiced view of the situation I'd like to mention the use of PROTECT by Ms Hoy. In this case it was being used to hide the fact that Mrs Johnson had not addressed the matter on October the 5th 2016 [and the term exhausted is not relevant to whether a structure was built to plan.](#)

I had become well acquainted with the manipulation of the complaints procedure for their own ends by South Tyneside Council and wrote and [told Mr Buck about it, 15-Jan-20, and I can confirm that he did not clarify who was or was not](#) your office manager in South Shields.

I saw that Mr Buck had been used by Mr Palmer in an attempt to close the conversation thread between you as my former MP, the Council and I who represented those who were aware the shed was materially bigger than the one permitted and I challenged him about it, [23rd January 2020](#):- *Dear Mr Palmer, You seem to have done some homework before our phone call on Monday the 13th but if you had paid attention to the facts rather than opinions based on fraudulent misrepresentations you would have come to the conclusion that UK Dock's shed is 3 meters taller than planned. [This can be confirmed by examination of the authorised drawing 8296/2.](#)*

I'd reverted to using my Hotmail address as a switch had been set to make sure that emails from the 'Harbour View' to you as the MP and associated emails about the 'shed', bounced and I'd forgotten that when I wrote to you on the 13th January so I wrote to [Mr Buck the day after my email to Mr Palmer did not bounce](#):- *Dear Simon, I notice that my email to Keith yesterday did not bounce from Emma's mailbox at parliament.uk. Thank you for removing the block from mick.dawson at the harbourview. When he alluded to vexatious mail I assumed he had his ear bent by someone at the Town Hall . . . .*

In brief then, in the days immediately following my call to 0191 427 1240 my emails to you were being diverted to suit Mr Palmer's needs but by the 24th January normal service had been restored.

For seven years South Tyneside Council had hidden the fact that UK Docks was 2.7m taller than planned, firstly by lying to the local residents and that includes you and I, then giving misinformation to the Ombudsman and finally Mr Palmer hinting that was not the Council but you and I who were conspiring to influence the Ombudsman and I [chose some good examples to prove Messrs Buck and Palmer wrong](#) and wrote to Mr Palmer on the 20th February 2020 and copied you and the Councillors etc.

I got an out of office reply which surprised me because it appeared to come from your Office in South Shields two seconds after your standard message, "Thank you for contacting Emma Lewell-Buck, Member of Parliament for South Shields. This reply is to confirm that your message has been safely received:-

Automatic reply: Conduct of South Tyneside Council  
From: PALMER, Keith  
Date: 20/02/2020 (12:06:30 BST)  
To: mick.dawson@theharbourview.co.uk  
I am out of the office until Monday 24th February 2020.

From those two responses one can see that normal service had [not been restored and I thought to remind Mr Buck of this, on the 24th February](#), and took the opportunity to show him how the office of the Local Government Ombudsman had been abused by South Tyneside Council by some in their Planning Office with reference to approved drawings of UK Docks' shed and added:- *"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.*

The significance approved drawing 8296/2 cannot be underestimated and I took the opportunity of broadcasting this to Keith Palmer, Emma Lewell-Buck MP, Cllr Angela Hamilton, Cllr David Francis, Nicola Robason, Stuart Wright, George Mansbridge, Hayley Johnson along with an explanation of the main lie told the about the shed's height:-

*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.*

As I tried to explain to the Audience and Content Director for Reach plc in the North East and Yorkshire, [it became Shed and Corruption – Part 16](#), it is meaningless to say that any complaints procedure was exhausted when referring to plans and drawings. A structure is either compliant or not compliant with the approved plans, it is a simple that. The approved plan says it should be 12.7m at that land end and has done since 1996, however the first response to my email to Mr Buck is not from him m Mr Buck but [the 5th person on the list of those copied, Nicola Robason, who said:-](#)

*“It remains the case that all complaints procedures relating to this matter have been exhausted both internally within the Council and externally.*

She was hiding the fact that the shed was 2.7m taller than planned and an hour later get a threat from Mr Buck which showed he had completely ignored my email of the 15th January - see above. Firstly he misapplies the Parliamentary code, overlooking the fact that I do not work in or around Parliament have a [name@parliament.uk](mailto:name@parliament.uk) email address and secondly if he had not requested my home phone number to give to Mr Palmer he would not have been so desperate in his defence of his so called [colleague to attempt to misuse the Parliamentary Code](#).

It was clear to me in the first few minutes of my call to Mr Palmer in your office on Westoe Road on the 13th January 2020 that he was not working in either of our interests, nor in Mr Buck's, now that I think about it, and it must of dawned on Mr Buck after my letter of the 15th January that he ought to set things right with the communications between myself and your office and they were fine until I sent Mr Palmer the two documents on the 20th February:- [Dishonesty at Town Hall - Emma30Oct19.pdf](#) and [Destroying Evidence.pdf](#).

I believe it did not suit those who wish to hide bad planning decisions and the wanton lack of building control nor whoever was controlling Mr Palmer but somehow he persuaded Mr Buck into writing on the 26th February:-

*Thank you for your recent emails. However, I must draw your attention to your continued vexatious, slanderous and personal attacks on a valued member of staff working from the Office of Emma Lewell-Buck MP.*

One phone call, and I only gave permission for it given to Mr Palmer on condition that he wished to talk about the shed and corruption, *does not constitute a continuous, vexatious, slanderous and personal attack* and similarly one complaint to the Chief Executive about his staff giving misinformation cannot be said to be:-

- *persistent refusal to accept a decision; persistent refusal to accept explanations;*
- *continuing to contact us without presenting new and relevant information*
- *Adopting a 'scattergun' approach: pursuing a complaint or complaints with the authority and, at the same time, with a Member of Parliament/a councillor/ independent auditor/the Standards Board/local police/solicitors/the Local Government Ombudsman/the press.*

[Alison Hoy, 29th April 2022](#)

What Alison calls a scattergun approach, I call a broadcast and the reason for it is twofold:-

1. to let those who are being called, put up a defence;
2. if no-one is copied into the reply, there are no defences and my claim is reasonable.

Mick Dawson  
20 July 2022

\* [Using Customer Advocacy to Misinform](#)

\*\* [who gave Mr Palmer his email at parliament.uk to misuse?](#)