

Dear All

Please see below for your information.

Kind regards
Holly

Dear Holly,

Thank you for the information. Apologies I must have missed that and I appreciate you pointing that out to me.

I have since spoken with Richard Crowther who is the local mayor who has agreed to include the issue I wanted to raise within his presentation. It relates to the scores given to the Hollin Busk site in the recent green belt review which I challenged with the council. The council have acknowledged that the scores are incorrect based on the distance between the Hollin Busk site and Bolsterstone and they are revisiting this and will publish an updated review in an addendum within the draft plan which was due around now but has been delayed until possibly September.

Bolsterstone is a hill village bordering the Peak District National Park and is a village washed over by the green belt being less than 500m from the Hollin Busk site. This was not picked up in the green belt review and hence the scoring is incorrect in the document which forms part of the local draft plan. As a result of this correction I am fully expecting a new score being attributed to the Hollin Busk site which will hopefully reflect the important contribution this land makes to the green open space that is Hollin Busk and the adjoining green belt.

Out of a maximum possible score of 20 for the green belt categories in scope, I'm expecting the Hollin Busk site to show maximum scores of 5 for 3 of the 4 categories scoring the same as or higher than other parcels of land already recommended for addition to the green belt. I eluded to this in my objection but as this investigation was still underway at the time of submission I was unable to confirm the outcome but I feel strongly that this is an important point which needs to be aired in the enquiry since there is now a distinct possibility that the Hollin Busk site could be

recommended for addition to the green belt and I wanted the inspector to be aware of this development.

Apologies for the late reply but please could you send me the link to the enquiry.

Kind regards,

Jeanette Mills.

BSc (Hons), FdSc, ACIB, CBCI

On Friday, 18 June 2021, 14:42:05 BST, Dutton, Holly < wrote:

Dear Jeanette,

The Inspector is aware of your email dated 15 June 2021. Whilst your email correctly refers to the 45 minute slot on Tuesday 22 June for interested parties to provide views, it failed to recognise that the draft Inquiry timetable that was issued also provided for a more dedicated slot on Tuesday 29 June between 11.00 and 12.30. Inspectors usually provide a shorter slot at the start of an Inquiry for those parties who can only attend on the first day. A longer slot is usually provided towards the end of the Inquiry, as in this case, for parties to provide views having heard the evidence of the main parties presented during the course of the Inquiry. The final version of the Inquiry Programme has now been produced which retains the 45 minute slot on Tuesday 22 June and the 90 minute slot on Tuesday 29 June.

I attach a copy of the final Inquiry Programme for your information.

Kind regards

Holly

Hi Holly,

Thank you for the update although I have to say that I'm very disappointed to note that the Friday option has been removed with only the Tuesday option remaining. I'm interested to understand why this is the case and why the Tuesday slot has not been extended accordingly. I have to say that the 45 minutes allocated to 3rd party speakers seems a little on the short side given the number of speakers who I understand wish to air their views on this emotive topic. I'm sure many would prefer to go later rather than sooner after hearing what other parties have to say during the preceding days. It seems the option to do that has now been taken away.

Thank you and kind regards,

Jeanette Mills.

BSc (Hons), FdSc, ACIB, CBCI

On Tuesday, 15 June 2021, 15:20:15 BST, Dutton, Holly wrote:

Hi Jeanette,

The Inspector has issued a second version of the draft inquiry timetable, which now has interested party speakers programmed for Tuesday 22 June. Please find attached a copy for your information.

A final version of the timetable is currently being discussed between the Inspector and the main parties and will be circulated on Friday 18 June.

Kind regards

Holly

Dear Jeanette,

Thank you for letting me know. I will pass your email on to the Inspector.

Kind regards

Holly

Dear Ms. Dutton,

Thank you for your reply. In that case please could you put me down for an afternoon slot on Friday 29th. I will try my utmost to attend in person. If an issue should suddenly arise at work I'll ask one of the Friends of Hollin Busk speakers to read out my statement in my absence.

Thank you and kind regards,

Jeanette Mills.

BSc (Hons), FdSc, ACIB, CBCI

On Friday, 11 June 2021, 11:06:19 BST, Dutton, Holly < wrote:

Dear Ms Mills,

Thank you for your email.

The Inspector notes your request to submit additional information. The time period for the submission of representation has passed and there is no provision for the continued receipt of information in circumstances where the parties have prepared proofs of evidence in accordance with the procedural timetable. The Inspector's preference is therefore that you present this evidence in person or ask one of the representors, such as Friends of Hollin Busk to include it in their verbal presentations to the Inquiry. Only if these options are exhausted would the Inspector be minded to accept it. However, if this is the case then the representation should focus only on the new matters and should not repeat the basis of objections already made.

Kind regards

Holly

Dear Ms. Dutton,

Re: APP/J4423/W/21/3267168 - Land at the junction of Carr Road and Hollin Busk Lane

I am contacting you regarding the above application and the upcoming inquiry due to start on 22nd June.

I was hoping to speak at the enquiry since new evidence has come to light around a topic I covered in my original objection, which at that time was in progress of being investigated by the council. This investigation is now complete and I wanted to provide an update and feed into the evidence submitted to the inspector.

I was hoping to present this during the enquiry as I feel that it is an important development, however as I work in business continuity and due to the ongoing pandemic situation I am working very long hours, I have a number of meetings already scheduled for that week and it is looking increasingly unlikely that I will be able to attend virtually. I was therefore wondering whether it would be possible for me to provide a further submission which would act as an addendum to my previous submission being an update on something I mentioned within it? And if so, would you be able to confirm that this information would be reviewed by the team and taken into account?

Kind regards,

Jeanette Mills.

BSc (Hons), FdSc, ACIB, CBCI

[Please take a moment to review the **Planning Inspectorate's Privacy Notice** which can be accessed by clicking this link.](#)



Please note that the contents of this email and any attachments are privileged and/or confidential and intended solely for the use of the intended recipient. If you are not the intended recipient of this email and its attachments, you must take no action based upon them, nor must you copy or show them to anyone. Please contact the sender if you believe you have received this email in error and then delete this email from your system.

Recipients should note that e-mail traffic on Planning Inspectorate systems is subject to monitoring, recording and auditing to secure the effective operation of the system and for other lawful purposes. The Planning Inspectorate has taken steps to keep this e-mail and any attachments free from viruses. It accepts no liability for any loss or damage caused as a result of any virus being passed on. It is the responsibility of the recipient to perform all necessary checks.

The statements expressed in this e-mail are personal and do not necessarily reflect the opinions or policies of the Inspectorate.