

16 September 2022

Dear Anne-Marie Trevelyan

Heart of Shed and Corruption

I could tell during March 2015 that South Tyneside Council were giving misinformation to the Local Government Ombudsman about the enclosure being built on one of the two slipways off River Drive [and wrote to my MP at that time about it:-](#)

Customer Advocacy, the team that respond to Stage III complaints on behalf of Mr Swales, the CEO, admit to the repair shelter being built without planning permission and this completely changes the complexion of the development on the slipway, River Drive (now UK Docks, formally Tyne Slipway) and I would like you to look into why it has been allowed to be built without planning permission and that the Planning Department are considering an application dated June 20th 2014 (just 3 days after the first shelter was signed off) to build an even larger shelter alongside the existing one.

Someone noticed that I had moved to Amble so the my email to Emma Lewell-Buck MP, was referred to the MP for Berwick for a response and it ended up after the Election in 2015, May 7, on your desk as the new MP for Berwick, and you copied me your letter to the Chief Executive for South Tyneside Council, Martin Swales of June 1, 2015. [You wrote, correctly:-](#)

It relates to a boat shelter at Tyne Slipway, River Drive, South Shields which Mr Dawson tells me was constructed outside the remits of the approved plan, which was a stated height of 15.5m. According to my constituent, the actual height of the structure is some 3 metres higher, yet was signed off by the Council regardless.

I said correctly because the approved plans from 1966 said that the landward end of the shed should have a height of 12.7m. I realised that a Senior Planning officer must have lied to the Ombudsman for her to report in mid April 2015, that the shed was not some three meters taller than the approved height and that they would repeat something similar to you and I advised you so and I had the grace to [let the Chief Executive know as well:-](#)

You have not specified that the stated height (15.5m) is of the river end of the shelter and it is likely that, Mr Swales, if he follows the arguments of the Planning Manager and the Head of Development Services before him, will say it refers to the road end.

This put the Chief Executive on the spot and to avoid following in the footsteps of his staff, he asked someone to mislead you on his behalf and he found an able candidate to fill his place and the first thing she did was to accuse and others and I of making allegations about the height and width of the shed. [That was in attachment 6 of the letter to you of June 25, 2015](#), and South Tyneside Council have refused to let me know the contents of the main letter or any of the five attachments so one can only assume they say something similar to:-

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 - Hayley Johnson, Corporate Lead Officer.

One only [has to look at an approved drawing](#) to see how deceitful she had been, particularly with regard to the shed's height but what is worse she adds a rider:- *"I hope that this information is useful. Please do not hesitate to share this letter with your constituent.*

Your office did not share the deceit with me and I only found out about it when I raised the subject of the plans for a second shed with planning officer Gary Simmonette who had taken over the handling of the [UK Docks development on River Drive from Mr Cunningham](#). He too wished to hide the fact that the shed was nearly 3m taller than permitted.

In response to my claim that [South Tyneside Council have been giving misinformation to the Local Government Ombudsman](#), the Chief Executive again relied on his Corporate Lead, Strategy and Performance, Hayley Johnson to do his dirty work for him and on August 1, 2016 she duly issued a denial:-

"There is no evidence to suggest that there has been deliberate misinformation provided by Council officers to the Local Government Ombudsman.

It was an outright lie of course, misinformation of that kind is deliberate, and to stifle any response Mrs Johnson, goes on to misuse a section of the Council's Staff code (F) to silence any criticism by saying that I have refused to accept the decision of the Council or Local Government Ombudsman, by arguing points of detail and adds the threat:-

"I now consider this matter closed. Should you continue to repeat historic complaint issues in your contacts, we will consider imposing formal restrictions on your contact with the Council"

[The plans authorised in 1966 are proof the UK Docks' shed is 2.7m taller than planned](#) and shows that our historic complaint is entirely reasonable and she was advised that I had consulted a solicitor about it. I say 'our' complaint as I was one of at least 20 people who had complained in 2013 that the shed was taller than planned.* [I had written to her on September 2, 2016:-](#)

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.

I then presented Mrs Johnson with an example of how the Ombudsman had been deceived by a Senior Planning Officer. All the drawings have the root 8296. She was told 1A was not authorised and 1B was drawn in 1967 and I go on to say:-

As both ../1A and ../1B show the river end to be 15.5m it is therefore equally reasonable for me to say that the road end is 12.8m. If, as the Planning Managers says, they are consistent with authorised drawing 8296/2 (river end height of 16m, road end of 13m), it will only go to confirm that the river end height is correct at 15.5m and not the road end.

To labour my point, that it is the Council abusing their own complaints procedure, I add:-

You also say I have attempted to have the complaint reconsidered in ways that are incompatible with your adopted complaints procedure, or with good practice. Please note (the) complaint was not treated properly from the beginning:-

- 1. the Principal Planning Officer received it but did not register it;*
- 2. the Planning Manager registered the escalation, not the complaint details;*
- 3. Mr Mansbridge instructed his staff to wind it up before the first stage was complete.*

Is it good practice to tell representatives of a protest group and the Councillors that a structure is 'legal' when it is not? Is it good practice to keep repeating that a structure is built to an approved height when it is not?

Legal is in quotes because it was the term used by first by UK Docks then [Councillor Anglin to mean that the shed had approval](#), December 1, 2013, and it would appear that that my response did not please the Chief Executive, Mr Swales nor his Head of Development Services, Mr Mansbridge, because by 2016, both were implicated in the fraudulent misrepresentation that UK Docks shed had been built to the approved height. I did not get a response from Mrs Johnson but from Ms Hoy:-

From: "Customer Advocates"

Date: Fri, September 16, 2016 11:42 am

To: "mick.dawson@theharbourview.co.uk"

This email has been classified as: NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

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.

Yours sincerely

Alison Hoy

Performance and Information Support Officer

Customer Advocacy

South Tyneside Council

It appears that Mrs Hayley Johnson had already been instructed to carry out her threat to section me because my email to her of the 2nd September and [the copy to Customer Advocacy on the 3rd](#), were never answered. Very obviously the further checks showed would have shown that the shed was 3m taller than planned and that someone had lied to the Ombudsman from the start. I had written to Mr Swales, July 8, 2016:-

I ask you to look again at this because there is a clear contradiction between what the Council were telling the LGO and what is known. Why your staff should misrepresent the facts to the LGO is for you to determine. That they have misinformed the LGO should be admitted and corrected and that is what this letter is about.

He clearly did not want to admit that his staff had misinformed the LGO nor why they chose to misrepresent the facts to them and to get his Corporate Lead off the hook for lying to you in 2015 [he allowed the misuse Section F to silence me in October 2016](#):-

“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.

Contrary to what Ms Hoy had written on Friday, September the 16th, my letter to Mrs Johnson was never considered and now one can add Mr Harding, the Head of Legal Services, to the Executive (Mr Swales and Mr Mansbridge) for Mrs Johnson had added:-

“If you have concerns that I have provided incorrect information in this letter and you wish to request a review of my decision, you should contact Mike Harding, Head of Legal Services, by writing to him at the address below: Town Hall and Civic Offices Westoe Road South Shields Tyne and Wear NE33 2RL.

Logic, if nothing else, had dictated that I would have been wasting my time as well as Ms Hoy's if I had bothered to respond, following Mrs Johnson's letter of the 5th October by writing to Mr Harding. There is still a letter to him complaining about [the conduct the Council Solicitor, Ms Hayton on the 19th April 2019 that remains unanswered](#).

When I started my Shed and Corruption Series last year someone [at the Town Hall realised very quickly after Part 2](#), where it was heading and while I was compiling the third post, I received a letter from a Ms Abbott who had been directed by Ms Hoy into applying the rewrite of Section F ([Complaints Policy 2019v1.5 Reviewers: Hayley Johnson, Ros Watters and Alison Hoy](#)).

Ms Abbott quotes from a 'supposed' letter from Ms Hoy of the 28-Aug-18:- *I am writing to you following Ms Hoy's letter to you of 28 August 2018, advising that the contact restrictions which had been imposed on your contact with the Council had been lifted. The letter advised you that we would continue to monitor your contacts with the Council, and should you attempt to resume your historic complaint, that we would take similar action in the future, should the need arise.*

I say supposed letter because I have no record of it and it waste of time asking either of them for a copy it because they have between them updated the Corporate Lead's device for corrupting the Council's Complaints Procedure with the misapplication of Section 7 which had replaced Section F.

[Ms Hoy had not told Ms Abbott was that there had only ever been one complaint](#) to the Ombudsman that the Council had been giving misinformation to them and that it had been dismissed because the second Inspector for the Ombudsman had said that that complaint remained that of the complaint to the first Ombudsman which was, *that UK Docks' shed off River Drive, South Shields, was nearly three meters taller than planned.*

When the authorised plans say what the river end of the shed should have a height of 15.5m and it is built to a height of 18.2m, it is not built to the approved height, *it is 2.7m taller than planned.*

I had explained in great detail to [the first Ombudsman how the shed was taller than planned](#) but she was persuaded otherwise by a Senior Planning Officer of South Tyneside Council as one can tell by her Summary which I have added as a footnote.

A few things before I close:-

1. [please see my latest explanation of how the overbuild was calculated in 2013](#) from the doctored drawings given to the Principal Planning Officer on September 6, 2013 by UK Docks and passed to the local residents the same day. It was not until the end of January that I saw the full copy of 8296/2 which was approved and shows the height of the landward end of the shed as 12.7m.
2. Cllr Anglin and the Chair of the TGA and arranged the meeting of November 25, 2013 which backed the concept of 'legal' to mean having approval which lead to a Senior Planning Officer giving misinformation to the Ombudsman. That resulted in a Council Solicitor repeating three of his, I was assuming it was a him, main misrepresentations in her defence of Cllr Anglin. Not only has the letter of the 19-Apr-19, see page 3, remained on file and been ignored but so has [the reminder of 19-Jun-19 to the Monitoring Officer/Head of Legal Services](#).
3. Both the letter to the Monitoring Officer, Mr Harding, 19-Apr-19 and the reminder 19-Jun-19 lie within the period 18-Apr-18 to 29-Apr-21 when I was Sectioned for the second time by Ms Abbott. Mr Swales had resigned in September 2020 and Mr Tew was not appointed until September 2021 so who instructed the second imposition of the Section so that the fraudulent misrepresentation that the shed had been built to the approved height need not be investigated.

4. In a similar vein [the estranged husband of the MP for South Shields](#) wrote on February 26 2020:-

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. Staff employed by Members of Parliament are protected under the Parliamentary Behaviour Code which is put in place to ensure a safe working environment and to safeguard them from bullying and harassment. It is now my belief that your continued emails denigrating Mr Palmer have breached that code.

Continued emails of this nature will be forwarded to the relevant Parliamentary Counsel for advice and direction.

Yours sincerely

Simon Buck

Office Manager for the Office of Emma Lewell-Buck MP

Member of Parliament for South Shields



Mr Buck's misuse of Parliamentary Behaviour Code is so reminiscent of Ms Abbot's misuse of Complaints Policy 2019v1.5 in 2021 and Mrs Johnson's misuse of Section F of an earlier Code in 2016 one can only conclude that Mr Buck has been given a lesson in corruption by South Tyneside Council. One phone call is not a continuous set of events and one complaint to the Ombudsman that a [Council has been giving misinformation/misrepresentation](#) is likewise the truth and not an allegation when *the approved drawings are taken onto consideration*.

5. When I had completed the draft letter to Mr Tilbury it occurred to me that it could be sent directly to the [Chief Executive and I did just that on July 8, 2016](#) and as his Corporate Lead had proved her value to him in falsely accusing the good citizens and I of making allegations about the height of the shed to you a year earlier she was just the person to be asked to misapply Section F.
6. Whoever was running South Tyneside Council after Mr Swales departure wished to continue to hide the truth about the shed and instructed Ms Abbott with Ms Hoy's help to reintroduce my being Sectioned in April 2021.

Mr Tew who was appointed as as Chief Executive in September 2021 had the choice of doing something about the corruption endemic throughout South Tyneside Council but chose to do nothing. It appears that Ms Abbott refused to be drawn into the fray again but [Ms Hoy stepped in to shut me up](#).

I recently rang the Houses of Parliament on a free phone service and was pleasantly surprised how quick my call was answered and they were able to confirm that Mr Palmer's palmerk@parliament.uk address was the responsibility of the office for the MP in South Shields rather than the Houses of Parliament. Mr Palmer was the supposed valued member of staff to whom I had been subjecting numerous vexatious, slanderous and personal attacks and it looks like the **single** phone call to her office in South Shields took place without Emma's knowledge while she was away in Parliament.

It is quite possible that a Mr Keith Palmer does not really exist. Perhaps he was a fiction and I was actually speaking to Mr Buck when I made the return call to the Office in South Shields, 0191 427 1240, on January 13, 2020. I do not think he has done himself any favours, as a day later, he was accusing [Emma and myself of colluding to sway the first Inspector for the Ombudsman's Decision](#).

More than that, he was implying that I was an impolite liar but it was common knowledge that the Local Labour Party were trying to get Emma deselected and that they had excluded Councillor Hamilton from normal council business. Emma was saved by the shenanigans of the 'Get Brexit Done' campaign though Cllr Hamilton was not so lucky.

[Mr Buck removed my email of the 13th January 2020 from Emma's inbox](#), shades of Mr Cunningham removing my email from Planning Enquiries six years earlier both of which were probably criminal offences though if they are not, I think they should be made so. No matter, I'll copy this to Emma and hope that the question of the shed's height can be settled once and for all.

Yours sincerely,
Michael Dawson

* it looks like I was the only one who had taken the complaint about the shed being nearly 3m taller than planned as far as the Ombudsman. If anyone else had, the Council never let on but one can be fairly certain they would have been told something similar by any Inspector for the Ombudsman:-

Summary: This complaint is not upheld. In 2013 a developer resumed building a boat shed for which he had planning permission and had started building in 2001. Local residents complained but the Council found the developer could still build the shed. However, the developer built it almost a metre wider than he should have done. There is no evidence of fault in the way the Council dealt with the breach of planning control and its decision not to take enforcement action. It kept residents informed throughout the process. 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.