

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 05 May 2026 13:17
To: Jane Curley [REDACTED]
Subject: Re NMA applications at Moneystone Quarry / NMA/2026/0006 and NMA/2026/0007



Dear Mrs Curley

Re NMA applications at Moneystone Quarry / NMA/2026/0006 and NMA/2026/0007

I am writing to you as the case officer as part of an ongoing complaint and as a preliminary objection to the above applications made by the Churnet Valley Conservation Society as CVCS is undertaking a critical and legalistic investigation into the actual details of the applications, but have already come up against some immediate problems over the scant and ambiguous details so far on the application form.

These are administrative issues which you might be able to sort for us as set out below .

First of all, according to the online statement generated yesterday it recorded that (quote)

As of May 4, 2026, application NMA/2026/0006 for Moneystone Quarry (Cheadle Road, Oakamoor, ST10 2DZ) is listed as an invalid application with Staffordshire Moorlands District Council, received on April 16, 2026. It is a Non-Material Amendment regarding a previous application, SMD/2016/0378

1) Could you please confirm the actual status for clarity before we delve too much further?

2). On both application forms there is a statement by SMDC which boldly says

It is an important principle of decision-making that the process is open and transparent.

However both application 0006 and 0007 contain redacted details and in particular in 0006 there is a section under the heading

Pre-application Advice where the applicant has responded to the question

Has assistance or prior advice been sought from the local authority about this application?

Yes

If Yes, please complete the following information about the advice you were given (this will help the authority to deal with this application more efficiently):

but then we find

Officer's name is redacted

Details of the pre-application advice received

***** REDACTED *****

***** REDACTED *****

Date (must be pre-application submission) 01/06/2016

Nature of advice given; Please refer to Supporting Planning Statement (June 2016)

So where is the transparency if we are not permitted to know who gave the advice or indeed what advice was given, as, if you examine the details on the 2016 application 0378 webpage, there is no entry for 1/6/16

nor a Supporting Planning Statement (June 2016) available?

As the whole argument regarding these applications under section 96 of the TCPA 1990 will hinge very much on the issue of whether the conditions requested for discharge are material or non material, we should be grateful if you would clarify those issues above and then

place this as **an objection** on the appropriate webpage.

Many thanks.

David Walters

Secretary

Churnet Valley Conservation Society

CVCS

Do you really need to print out this Email? Be green - keep it on the screen.

This email is intended for the addressee(s) only and may contain sensitive, privileged or confidential information that could be protectively marked. If you are not the addressee please do not use the information in any way. If you have received this email in error please notify the sender immediately and delete it from your system. Thank you.

The Council may be required to disclose this email or any responses to it under the Freedom of Information Act 2000. The way in which we handle personal information is set out in our privacy notice and is available at <https://www.staffs Moorlands.gov.uk/YourData>
