

Amble
2nd May 2023

Dear Alison

Deceit and Dishonesty

On 13th April 2023, a comment against the post on theharbourview.co.uk, titled, [Threat: Simon Buck, 26-Feb-20](#) was made by Simon Buck:- *“Will you just give it a rest mate!*

Sorry Alison, no, not until the Principal Planning Officer, Mr P Cunningham, admits he was being economical with the truth when he passed me plans that could be used to back the falsehood, [made by him on 20-Dec-13](#), the height being compliant with an error:- *“Mr Dawson – once again – I have measured this on site and have copied the 1996 plans across to you twice already (attached again for your use) and I have explained during our meeting that the base and height of the structure are compliant...this is the end of the matter as far as I am concerned.*

Sorry no, not until the former Head of Development Services, Mr G Mansbridge, admits he had been wrongly advised when, in response to our Petition. [He had lied when he said in April 2014:-](#) *“The approved dimensions of the steelwork are: Proposed height 15.5m at the River Drive end.* South Tyneside Council had recovered an approved drawing from 1996 in September 2013 and the Planning Manager approved a drawing made in August 2013 that [showed the shed was some 3m taller than planned](#) in October 2013. 8296/14 also showed that the shed laid on footings made in 2001 to be wider than planned.

Sorry no, not until South Tyneside Council admit that the shed on UK Docks’ slipway, off River Drive, is about 3m taller than permitted and that they had fraudulently misrepresented the [height of the shed to the Ombudsman in 2015:-](#) *“The complainant says the shed is also 3 metres higher than it should be. The Council says it is not. There is no fault in how the Council decided the shed is the permitted height.*

Sorry no, not until the Corporate Lead, Mrs H Johnson admits that she was in the wrong when she told the MP for Berwick in 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.*

It is not an allegation to claim a structure is nearly 3m taller than planned [when it is nearly 3m taller than planned](#). Please see above, per Mr Mansbridge and an unknown Senior Planning Officer who repeated the fraud about the shed’s height to the Ombudsman.

I had taken [your letter of the 9th December 2015](#) to a solicitor in Sunderland and gave him a potted history of the shed with particular reference to the drawings, approved and non-approved that had been provided by Maughan Reynolds Partnership Ltd over the years and it was he who suggested challenging what [South Tyneside Council had told the Ombudsman](#).

Sorry no, not until the Corporate Lead, Mrs H Johnson again, [admits that she was lying when she said in August 2016:-](#) *“There is no evidence to suggest that there has been deliberate misinformation provided by Council officers to the Local Government Ombudsman, Neither do I have evidence to question the content of the Ombudsman's investigation.*

Sorry no, not until you admit that you had been ill advised to make sure my observations [made about the Stage 3 response in September 2016 were ignored](#):- “Dear Michaela ‘South Tyneside Council and the Local Government Ombudsman’ - Please excuse me for writing directly to you. I've copied you the letter I wrote to Haley Johnson yesterday. I assume you have access to my letter to the Chief Executive 8-Jul and her reply to me 1-Aug. She has done exactly as my solicitor predicted she would do, she said I had submitted repeated complaints, essentially regarding the same issue after the complaints process has been exhausted.

Sorry no, not while the Council avoid the question of the shed’s height. Your response, 16-Sep-16 made to my email of the 2nd September:-

Dear Mr Dawson

Thank you for your email and the copy of the letter sent to Mrs Johnson.

Mrs Johnson received your letter on her return to work 12 September and acknowledges its receipt.

For your information Michaela Green (nee Hamilton) is currently on secondment and therefore your email will be considered along with the letter to Mrs Johnson.

You will be contacted in due course following further checks into this matter.

There were no checks, one only has to glance at [the approved drawing from 1996, 8296/2](#), to see that the shed is taller than permitted and the Corporate Lead was allowed to repeat much of the misinformation she had written on August 1st and [carry out her threat to Section me in October 2016](#), so that the Chief Executive could avoid having to admit that the Local Residents were correct about the shed’s height and that a [Senior Planning Officer had lied to the Ombudsman](#):- *We will not acknowledge or respond to any issues that have already been the subject of investigation by the Council, or by the Local Government Ombudsman. Any such correspondence from you will be read and placed on file, but we will not acknowledge or respond to it.*

Sorry, Alison and this is most important as it shows that the Local Government Ombudsman (LGO) was in league with the Executive of South Tyneside Council (STC) in hiding the fact that the shed was taller than planned when he changed the complaint from one about the size of the shed to one about the lack of enforcement. [Mr P Lewis for the Ombudsman wrote on the 30-May-2017](#):- *However, after having read the decision by the Local Government Ombudsman in 2015, I consider that the matter of which you complain remains that of the lack of enforcement by the Council. The Local Government Ombudsman gave you full and detailed reasons for reaching her decision.*

Sorry no, when I had pointed out that UK Docks were in breach of the 5th condition in late December 2016, the Council said that the site had no restrictions. Please note the fifth condition referred specifically to the use of the shed:- *“No works, other than the launching or beaching of vessels, shall take place within the shelter between the hours of 7pm and 7am Monday to Saturday and not at all on Sundays or Bank Holidays unless any written consent of variation is previously given by the Development Corporation as local planning authority.*



Sorry no, not until I get an apology from the Council’s Corporate Lead for repeating her claim that I was being unreasonable on 17-Jan-17, please see the critical review of the letter from the Council which was written in 2017 but not posted until today.

It would appear that there were some officers in the LGO who were as corrupt as some of those in STC who have been asked to [hide the facts behind both the redevelopment 71 Greens Place](#) and in the case of UK Docks’ shed on their River Drive slipway by repeating Mrs H Johnson’s unreasonable demand made six and a half years ago on 28th April 2023 and repeating:- *Any emails you make to officers of the Council regarding this subject, will not be acknowledged or responded to.*

Your given reasons for hiding the truth about both No. 71 and UK Docks' shed are unsound:-

I have noted a link to the Council's Complaints Policy:

<https://www.southtyneside.gov.uk/article/71788/Complaints-Policy> and would refer you to Section 7 on Dealing with Unreasonable Behaviour. In my view, your behaviour is unreasonable because:

- 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.*

Firstly, the link to Article 71788 given in the contact review fails with the message "Sorry, the page you requested is not available" but more importantly and unlike you, I refuse to accept decisions based on fraudulent misrepresentations, one of them being that the Haigs had completed the redevelopment of their property in accordance with ST/0966/12/FUL.

The other is the misrepresentation that UK Docks had complied with the second condition of the grant made by the Tyne and Wear Development Corporation, ST/0242/96UD. Anyone can see that they had not by looking at the approved plans either from 1996 or 2013 but to return to 2023 and the comment posted just over two weeks ago:- "Will you just give it a rest mate!"

I appreciate that anyone could have generated simonwrs@gmail.com on server 81.134.17.247 but it does not matter if it was or was not the former partner of the MP for South Shields.

Whoever it was, he or she, has inadvertently taken us back to a point on the [timeline we have shared since 2014 when you first wrote to me on the 11th July](#):- *Your letter to the Chief Executive, Martin Swales, was forwarded to our team on 7 July 2014 in accordance with the Councils corporate complaints procedure. Following your email of 10 July to George Mansbridge, in which you confirmed that following your earlier meeting with him you still wished to proceed with your complaint, we have now escalated this to stage 3 of the procedure.*

I can say this because the escalation by your office to Stage 3 is central to the corruption of the Council's corporate complaints procedure. My [letter of the 7 July 2014 states very clearly that the shed is taller and wider](#) than the plans allow and I attached a copy of my email to the Planning Manager of 04-Mar-2014, thanking him for conceding that the shed was, as we said it was, nearly 3m taller than the approved plans of 1996, 8296/2, allowed.

My [email to Mr Mansbridge of 10 July says nothing about Stage 3](#), I said:- *There did not appear to be anything new on the table regarding my complaint and I cannot change my view that UK Docs built the Slipway Shed on River Drive to one set of plans while asking their agents to submit different ones to suggest that they were complying with the conditions laid out in an earlier application. I would still like the office of the Chief Executive to review my complaint.*

In April/May 2019, UK Docks told either the MP for South Shields or Cllr Hamilton or both that they had been given retrospective permission for their shed, because they could not provide any drawings to show otherwise, and it took me until December or get confirmation that it was a lie but the Monitoring Officer added a catch all to hide the fact that Mr G Mansbridge version of my complaint was presented to the Ombudsman [rather than the original complaint raised on the 10th January 2014](#).

The catch all, by the way, states:- *I understand that all complaints procedures regarding this matter have been exhausted both internally within the Council and externally.*

Exhausted by the sheer volume of misinformation ladled out by STC and the comment made on against on the website a couple of weeks ago brings us full circle to the beginning of 2020. Wheels within wheels [which I have previously described as Cycles of Deceit](#).

On January 8th 2020, Mr Buck [emailed me at the harbourview.co.uk from the Office of the MP for South Shields](#) requesting my home phone number to give to his colleague, Mr Keith Palmer and I was immediately suspicious as I had been in contact with her office for a few years and no-one had asked me for my home phone number.

I had met Emma at a meeting in 2016 and we both agreed that South Tyneside Council were being evasive about development on the slipway off River Drive that belonged to UK Docks and I had been corresponding with her Office Manager, Rebecca Heath, about it until I received a message from Emma, very late in 2019:-

Date: 23/12/2019 (16:09:38 BST)
To: mick.dawson@theharbourview.co.uk
Cc: Cllr Angela Hamilton, Nicola Robason, Cllr David Francis, Alison Hoy
Good afternoon Mick,
I am aware Angela and David are dealing with this, please can you let me know if there is anything needed from me.
Best wishes, hope you have a lovely Christmas
Emma

I thanked her for her response and added:- *“I hope to be back in touch when Parliament resits. Congratulations in retaining your seat. All the best for the New Year.*

I never got back to her because I became aware over the Christmas break that both Emma and Cllr Hamilton were having trouble with the Constituency Labour Party and other Cllrs under the control of the then Leader of the Council, Cllr Malcolm and please notice that Mr Buck was not included in the people dealing with our complaint about the shed but I was curious to know what he was up to so gave him my home phone number and laid down a condition:- *“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.*

I discovered the following Monday, the 13th, when I returned Mr Palmer’s call from Emma’s Office that corruption at the Town hall and UK Docks were the last thing he wanted to talk so [naturally I asked Emma what was going on](#):- *I answered a call today from a Mr Keith Palmer on 01914271240 and we spoke and 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. You and I both know this to be nonsense as the shed is on your patch.*

As he had also gone on about expensive litigation, vexatious complaints etc., I attached a copy of of the [letter I had received from Peter Dunn and Co](#), and next morning thought to explain why I had attached it:- *“I gave my phone details to you(r) 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? [The case ZA4803, please see attached](#), and it has been with you for many years although it was passed to Anne Marie Trevelyan MP while I was lodging in Amble.*

Mr Palmer rang from Emma’s office while I was out which was why I returned his call and he made it very clear that corruption at that Town Hall and UK Docks was the last thing he wanted to discuss.

As you can see response made by Mr Buck on the 14th January 2020 was in complete [contrast to](#)

[my exchange with Emma some weeks before](#), especially with the added implication that I was impolite and lying:- *“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.*

Besides implying that I was telling tales Mr Buck confirmed for me that Mr Palmer had been appointed by someone from the Town Hall with an interest in concealing the fact that the Local Labour Party had been [bullying Emma since she was first elected in 2013](#):- *“Lawyers acting for Emma Lewell-Buck say the South Shields MP, who could soon be ousted by the so-called trigger ballot process, has been subject to six years of abuse from local party officials.*

It does not look very good does it, Mr Palmer not only hides the fact that he would have been aware that I had already taken advice from a solicitor and Mr Buck attempts to hide the fact that his former partner had been ‘bullied’ by those of a misogynist persuasion at the Town Hall for the best part of seven years and it looks from here like they [transferred all their loathing towards Cllr Hamilton](#) once Emma had been safely re-elected as the MP.

I thought I had resolved the issue [after addressing the pair of them, 16-Jan-20](#):- *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.*

Apparently not, Mr Buck was persuaded by those in charge at the Town Hall, remember Council leader Iain Malcolm did not go till he was ousted in November 2020, [to accuse me outrageous behaviour, 26-Jan-20](#):- *“Dear Mr Dawson, 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.”*

Excuse me Alison, but talking on the phone once, to someone pretending to be an MP’s member of staff can hardly be a, *“continued vexatious, slanderous and personal attack”* on anyone and Mr Buck’s recording of it would have to have been heavily edited to disguise the fact that Mr Palmer was being mocked and he says, 3 years later:- *“Will you just give it a rest mate!*

Sorry no, not until I get an extremely humble apology from Mr Palmer’s masters at the Town Hall or those that followed them, late in 2020, I will not give it a rest. Towards the end Cllr I Malcolm’s reign at the Town Hall the Chief Executive saw which way the wind was blowing and fled a month or so earlier than his Council Leader on September 30th 2020 and that left Cllr T Dixon in charge of the Council from November 2020.

Mr Swales may not have devised the scheme to obstruct the truth behind the shed’s survival but it originated on his on his watch and should have died a death on his and Cllr Malcolm’s departure but it did not because it was so useful to his successor Cllr Dixon who was in control in 2021 when it was reissued on the [29th April 2021 by Paula Abbott at your guidance after Section F had been replaced by Section 7](#) Complaints Policy 2019v1.5 when she wrote:-

I enclose a copy of our Complaints Policy and would refer you to Section 7 on Dealing with Unreasonable Behaviour. In my view, your behaviour is unreasonable because:

- *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.*
- These restrictions will be put in place immediately and will be reviewed in twelve months’ time.*

Yours sincerely, Paula Abbott, Information and Feedback Officer.

At your bidding, I assume, because it would have been you who had given Paula the edited list of unanswered emails and may I point out that it is not unreasonable to claim that a structure was 3m taller than planned when it is 3m taller than planned and I [carefully explained this to her in May 2021](#), deliberately copying it to the Interim Head of Legal Services, J Rumney, rather than Cllr Dixon.

Cllr Hamilton's letter to the Chief Executive, Mr J Tew reminded me that all was not well with STC and I ran a check on what Cllr Dixon and Mr Rumney were doing at the Town Hall and it linked well with Mr Buck's threat of the 26th February 2020. The link between those at the Town Hall and Messrs Buck and Palmer being the word vexatious – [see Chris Binding's informative article of 28th February 2019](#).

Since Mr Buck posted his comment against his threat of 26-Feb-20, "*Will you just give it a rest mate*", someone from the Town Hall has asked the Gazette to change the publication date from 26-Feb-19 to 07-Jul-20 in an attempt to break that link.

It is that sort of dishonesty, by Councils such as yours, that gives rise to vexatious behaviour but I defy you to produce anything even remotely vexatious, written by me, to you or any of your colleagues, since the height of the shed was first queried in September 2013.

Yours sincerely
Michael Dawson