
From: Robert Craggs [REDACTED]
Sent: 22 June 2010 10:40
To: POServices
Cc: 'Chloe Smith MP'; 'Colin Bland'; 'Phil Kirby'; Joint Core Strategy; 'June Hunt'; 'Malcolm Martins'; 'Mollie Howes'; 'Tony & Ann Stubbs'; 'Marc & Kim & Pierce Allen'
Subject: Re: GNDP's Joint Core Strategy

Dear Simon,

Thank you kindly for clarifying these points. I did read the Guidance Notes for the Examination into the Joint Core Strategy and I confess to being unsure how the Exploratory Meeting differed from the Pre-Hearing meeting in terms of substance because the key issues discussed clearly impacted on the soundness of the plan. Key points raised such as there not being a Plan B and the Strategy being dependent upon the NDR which was far from certain to be approved or the proposed length of it being approved; the issues on transport and infra-structure were not just concerns to be overcome but were fundamental concerns discussed within the context of the soundness of the strategy. Even on reading the Inspectors' notes of 24th May on the Exploratory Meeting by implication what is being scrutinised and examined in terms of viability; constraints; credibility etc are discussed in fundamental terms and in the context of the soundness of the strategy. The report itself describes such points in terms of soundness.

Trying to avoid semantics or justify my ignorance in any way, what was crystal clear from that meeting was that a considerable amount of work was needed including the production of alternative strategies that obviously required re-engagement with the public in terms of consultation. What I perceive happening is the GNDP pushing ahead with issues as if the fundamental points discussed at the EM are being ignored and after all where is there any evidence of alternatives being considered?

I do thank you for your reply and I trust that any misunderstanding or lack of understanding I have helps others to understand this process better.

What clearly has heightened suspicion and distrust is the way GNDP have gone about the lip service consultation and the use of unannounced Extraordinary General Meetings to seek or secure finance and approve the JCS in spite of widespread public opposition that is being badly managed.

Thank you once again.

Regards

Bob Craggs

On 21 Jun 2010, at 13:31, POServices wrote:

Dear Mr Craggs,

Please be aware that the Exploratory Meeting held last month was not to look into the soundness of the JCS. The whole Examination process to look in to the soundness of the JCS begins when the GNDP submits the Core Strategy to the Secretary of State and finishes when the appointed Inspector submits his binding report to the GNDP.

The purpose of the Exploratory Meeting was to flag up some initial concerns that the Inspectors had and to suggest ways in which GNDP might address those concerns. The Inspectors agreed to invite comments from the floor to help their own decision making process.

As a result of the response given by GNDP to the Inspectors initial concerns, and to what they heard at the meeting, the Inspectors have taken the view that the hearing sessions should

proceed in the autumn. It is unlikely that the Inspectors will reach a conclusion on the soundness of the Core Strategy until after the hearing sessions have finished and all the evidence has been given and discussions have taken place.

Please also be aware that the only reason that the Inspectors are currently minded not to have a Pre-Hearing Meeting is that most of the information given out at a Pre-Hearing Meeting has already been included in the guidance notes that I prepared and circulated prior to the Exploratory Meeting. To organise another meeting to cover procedural matters already covered could well have been construed as a waste of council tax paters money.

I hope this is helpful.

Yours

Simon Osborn

POServices

Programme Officer

From: Robert Craggs

Sent: 21 June 2010 12:46

To: Chloe Smith MP

Cc: Simon Osborn Programme Officer JCS; Colin Bland; Phil Kirby; Sandra Easthaugh; June Hunt; Malcolm Martins; Mollie Howes; Tony & Ann Stubbs; Marc & Kim & Pierce Allen

Subject: Fwd: GNDP's Joint Core Strategy

Dear Chloe,

I trust that the attached correspondence is self explanatory.

I am not so much confused about the purpose of this Inspectors' Exploratory Meeting that I attended as I am concerned and I suspect that I am one of many.

At the commencement it was clear that this Exploratory Meeting was looking into the soundness of the JCS which was something that the public had been invited to comment on in previous months in the JCS consultation and many objective comments were lodged criticising the soundness of 'the plan'. The Exploratory Meeting was a ringing endorsement of these criticisms serving to point out that the strategy was seriously flawed requiring fundamental reconsideration that Phil Kirby and GNDP colleagues appeared to accept judging from their replies to many questions put to them. In fact this Exploratory Meeting never finished because it was, for all intents and purposes suspended because this JCS was appearing more and more unsustainable as the meeting went on such that the "next" meeting was being progressively put back from July, to September at the earliest then eventually to October. It was not made clear whether this "next" meeting would be the Pre-Hearing meeting or whether it would be a continuation of the Exploratory Meeting; indeed a precise question on this matter was put to Inspector Foster seeking a specific answer but this question was not answered. However the only real conclusion that I can now reach following this Exploratory Meeting is that Phil Kirby and the GNDP are treating this Exploratory Meeting in exactly the same way that they treated the public consultation on the JCS and that is they are ignoring the guidance of the Inspectors just as they ignored the comments made by the public about the soundness (and legality) of the strategy.

Consultation with the public came up several times during the course of the inspectors' EM - including the need to re-engage in public consultation on necessary alternatives to the JCS but instead of this happening the GNDP are forging ahead regardless.

It seems to me that there is a fundamental democratic deficiency here that Parliament needs to examine.

Perhaps Simon Osborn the Program Officer can indicate how many other similar concerns have been expressed.

There is no implied criticism into the conduct of this Exploratory Meeting, in fact I would compliment Inspector Foster and his colleague Ass.t Inspector Fox on a thorough and democratically conducted examination but it all seems to have been a waste of time and expense.

Would you please look into this matter from a point of democratic injustice?

If I can be of any further assistance in looking into this important matter I am at your

disposal.

Yours sincerely,

Robert Craggs

Begin forwarded message: