

From: Les Trigg
Sent: 13 June 2019
To: andrew_matheson
Cc: Alex Yendole
Subject: RE: Stone Neighbourhood Plan - Responses to Initial Enquiries

Mr Matheson,

Please see the responses to the questions you have raised below:

1. You note that LGS 54 is within the Green Belt and therefore can be omitted because it is already afforded "maximum protection"; however, it would appear that a significant part of LGS 21 is also in the Green Belt?

We agree with these observations and conclusions

2. Your table that mirrors my queries extends only to LGS 54 thereby omitting LGS 55-57 - are there responses on the last three?

The Council's view is that these sites would benefit from the additional protection afforded by a Local Green Space designation for the reasons set out in the body text of the Council's response to you of 6th June 2019.

3. In relation to LGS 34 you note the decision of the High Court but I have been unable to access this using the reference provided - could you or Mr Yendole (copied in) please provide a hyperlink to or paper copy of the decision statement?

A copy of the decision of the High Court is attached. I would also like to provide the following information, supplied by the secretary of the Aston Lodge Resident's Association:

"Attached is the order from the High Court which approved our application to challenge the Inspector's decision. A hearing date was subsequently set.

The Secretary of State, SBC and then Fradley subsequently confirmed that they would not be defending the case.

We can expect a quash order to be written by the High Court, however it cannot be written until the losing parties have agreed the apportioning of the costs. The Sec of State has agreed to pay costs to the date they pulled out, Feb 19th. Fradley has not responded to our claim for our costs to be paid by him. The High Court has now arranged a hearing to settle the costs. This should force Fradley's hand and force him to settle and then the quash order can be written."

4. Could Mr Yendole (copied in) please comment on the present Green Infrastructure status of the site of LGS 40 and why part (unidentified) of the site might be "being marketed for development despite its green infrastructure status"?

I assume that this response will be provided direct by Mr Yendole on behalf of Stafford Borough Council.

I hope that the answers above have clarified these outstanding points. Please let me know if you need any further clarifications, or have additional questions.

Regards,

Les Trigg

Les Trigg | Town Clerk | 01785 619740
Stone Town Council | 15 Station Road | Stone | ST15 8JP
les.trigg@stonetowncouncil.gov.uk | www.stonetowncouncil.gov.uk

From: andrew_matheson
Sent: 10 June 2019
To: Les Trigg <les.trigg@stonetowncouncil.gov.uk>
Cc: Alex Yendole <ayendole@staffordbc.gov.uk>
Subject: RE: Stone Neighbourhood Plan - Responses to Initial Enquiries

Dear Mr Trigg

I have spent a little time trying to draw together all the various comments relating to the proposed Local Green Spaces which, subject to the weather, I intend to visit next week. Meanwhile there are just a few points that have arisen:

- You note that LGS 54 is within the Green Belt and therefore can be omitted because it is already afforded "maximum protection"; however, it would appear that a significant part of LGS 21 is also in the Green Belt?
- Your table that mirrors my queries extends only to LGS 54 thereby omitting LGS 55-57 - are there responses on the last three?
- In relation to LGS 34 you note the decision of the High Court but I have been unable to access this using the reference provided - could you or Mr Yendole (copied in) please provide a hyperlink to or paper copy of the decision statement?
- Could Mr Yendole (copied in) please comment on the present Green Infrastructure status of the site of LGS 40 and why part (unidentified) of the site might be "being marketed for development despite its green infrastructure status"?

Kind regards

Andrew Matheson

Independent Examiner