

July 8th 2014 – Meeting at Town Hall Town Re: Drawings/Plans of UK Docks Shelter

The meeting was arranged to view 8296/14 specifically but no minutes were taken so it was not recorded that the Planning Manager failed to bring it with him.

Those present were: G Mansbridge – Head of Development Services, G Atkinson – Planning Manager, I Rutherford – Environment, B Dawson and M Dawson – protestors.

There was a very brief discussion of 8296/1A which was produced – M Dawson pointed out that the drawing showed a height of 15.5m at both ends of the shelter which brought the discussion to an end.

There was a similarly brief discussion of 8296/2 which was produced because it did not bear an authorisation stamp. Mr Dawson took that copy away for future reference. Mr Mansbridge had already sent Mr Dawson a copy of 8296/1A and he had spotted that both ends showed a height of 15.5m.

The planning Manager said that 8296/14 was only an engineers sketch and as he had already been a bit abrupt* about him presenting 8296/1A, Mr Dawson reserved commenting on the lack of [the drawing the meeting was arranged to view](#).

He did complain to the assembled company that he thought that the Port of Tyne had undue influence on the decisions made by the Council's Planning Department and in particular the development of the UK Docks site on River Drive.

End of meeting.

* Mrs B Dawson thought that it was rude to accuse Council Officers of corruption but she had not attended a similar meeting seven months before to examine [approved documents only to find none were produced](#). That was attended by the Principal Planning Officer, Mr Cunningham, two Cllrs McMillan and Anglin, two representatives of a [firm supplying services to the Navel Dockyard in Portsmouth](#) and Mr Dawson,

[However Mr Mansbridge thought otherwise:-](#) *“I fully understand that there are issues associated with the UK Docks development that you remain unhappy with however I did appreciate the manner by which to conducted yourself when we met; so thank you for that.*

The sting was that the complaint will go forward to Stage 3 with the lie that 8296/14 was not to scale whatever was said. Mr Atkinson tried to claim that the gable end represented the inland end of the shed which was so obviously a lie that he had changed one lie for another when he claimed that the drawing was not to scale.

As soon as Mr Atkinson had been invited to the meeting Mr Dawson realised that the meeting would like the one seven months earlier and would be rigged to hide the truth about the shed's height and that was why Mr Dawson wrote [to the Chief Executive the day before](#) carefully explaining how the situation had come about.