

[REDACTED]

From: Ben Haywood
Sent: 30 June 2026 17:02
To: Planning Comments (SMDC)
Subject: FW: Mr.A.Stokes,- Moneystone Quarry - Objections - Please File On all quoted planning records and acknowledge receipt.

[REDACTED]

From: Paul Housiaux [REDACTED] >
Sent: 26 June 2026 16:14
To: Andrew Stokes <[REDACTED]>
Subject: Mr.A.Stokes,- Moneystone Quarry - Objections - Please File On all quoted planning records and acknowledge receipt.

Mr.A.Stokes,
CEO,
SMDC LPA.
Moorlands House,
Stockwell Street,
Leek,
ST106 HQ.

26th June 2026.

Dear Mr. Stokes,
Moneystone Quarry - NMA/2026/0006 NMA/2026/0007 ,DOC/2026/0045, SMD/2026/0378, SMD/2019/0646, SMD/2023/0532.

I urge you in your capacity of CEO with a duty to lead and guide an Authority already sanctioned but the Secretary of State for Housing that you exercise your powers to prevent the further waste of public money on the above cited planning matters

I have today been able to study the *claimed* ' Parameter Plan -(red line) attached to the most recent applications cited above and which have been ' called in' for determination by the PAC.

The exhibited red line plan, which is applicable to the determination of all the above cited application plans appears to show that the Tunnel linking Q2 to Q1 and thus the whole of the MQ Development Site meet with a red line plan that also claims to act as a Parameter plan linking to Q1&Q2. That is a false impression and has no legal validity. Please confirm that in deciding the applications only the Parameter plans filed in the ' Outline Application SMD/2016/0378 will be put before the PAC when they sit to determine the applications.

I remind you and the Case Officer that myself, CVCS and others have pointed out in earlier correspondence that the MQ development does not have,

1. The benefit of Outline Planning Permission for the use of the Tunnel linking Q1 with Q2.

2. Cannot use the main entrance to Q's1 and Q2 because the Case Officer *expressly excluded* in her report to the PAC in the hearing SMD/2016/0378 from granting ' Outline Planning Permission ' Access to and in respect of the Sibelco' Lab building - (now repeated described within the planning file as ' a Hub building ')- or Access thereto. Access as used by the Case Officer in her report to the PAC in the matter of SMD/2016/0378;is to be given its normal English meaning -[See Interpretation] Act 1979]: It follows that neither the Applicants nor the Planning Officer can attempt to utilise a changed meaning to the words she used in SMD/2026/0378 and later confirmed accurately in 2020 in her evidence to the Valuation Tribunal of England*. Put plainly the Developers have no access from Eaves Lane to the Laboratory building which does not have Pilkington Principle compliant access for the proposed Development. They do not.
3. In 2020 The Case Officer gave evidence by way of a statement to the *Valuation Tribunal of England - (I have a copy of the Judgement)- in which Mrs. Curley *accurately* discharged her duty of Candour to the Tribunal and also her obligations under the Nolan Principles, reinforcing the factual evidence that the Developers *do not have access to Q1 or for use of the Lab buildings as the proposed uses are outwith the SMD/2026/0378.*
4. Further, after the PAC had heard SMD/2016/0378 but before Mr. Haywood's claimed notice of Planning Permission dated 26/10/2016, Mrs Curley wrote to Alice Henderson of Asteer Planning, Agents for the Developers, saying "***we -(SMDC LPA) do not know your clients intentions for Q2.***" This makes clear that as a matter of fact and law the PAC that heard and decided SMD/2026/0378 *could not have ' properly weighed the planning balance on this aspect of the Application as was their legal responsibility with regard to Q2.* It would be illogical to assert that that which was not known to the Case Officer after the PAC had announced their decision in SMD/2016/0378 could *form any part* of the PAC's decision in the Outline Planning Application SMD/2026/0378. Mrs Curley's comments are the clearest possible evidence of that fact.
5. It follows that Q2 *never had the benefit of ' Outline Planning Permission.'* The net effect is that - (a) the Lab (aka Hub) buildings and access from Eaves Lane thereto does not and now cannot have the benefit of Outline Planning Permission. -(b) That the Tunnel cannot be used or considered as part of access to Q2 for the purpose of the Leisure Project.. (c) The Q 2 does not have the benefit of Outline Planning Permission and in any event cannot, for the purpose of the proposed development be used to provide access to a proposed site that fails to meet the requirements of the Pilkington Principle. (d) That the Case Officers failure, evidenced within the Authority'd webcasts, to properly advise the members of the PAC of the accurate position has lead the PAC members into error in their decision making in the matter of SMD/2023/0532.
6. As is made clear in the Planning entry that relates to NMA/2026/0006, NMA/2026/0007 and DOC /2026/0045 etc. as validated by Case Officer Mrs Curley that SMD/2016/0378, SMD/2019/0646 and SMD/2023/0532 are validated and are an integral part of the cited but wrongly claimed as being ' None Material Amendments' ,as inaccurately claimed in the validated planning applications cited.
7. It follows from the above that both the public and the members of the PAC are *entitled as a matter of law, fact and in compliance with the SMDC SCI through out the planning process* to be consulted and of the basis of all required facts, evidence, law and policy requirements and the PAC additionally have a statutory duty in discharging their duty to ' *properly weigh the planning balance*' in the NMA's and the DOC applications, and to considered any misleading and inaccurate claims implied by the ' validation' process of these listed application that they (my description ' only')- amount to None Material Amendments etc. This is a totally misdescription of what is being attempted in these applications and I submit that the Case Officer must understand both as matters of fact and law that the proposed use of the legislation in this way has no validity when set against the known facts and law that as a Planning Officer she is deemed to know and understand.

8. For the Avoidance of doubt the procedure utilised in these latest application cannot be used for or in the proposed manner and I find it surprising in the extreme that the Case Officer felt able to validate the applications. Additionally as a Planning 'expert' the Case Officer is deemed to know the law and procedures.
9. The MQ development does not meet the legal requirements of the Supreme Court decision in Hillside Estates which re-affirmed with great clarity that SMDC LPA cannot validate or grant any part of the NMA/2026/0006, NMA/2026/0007 or any other related matters including the Application DOC/2026/0045 attempt to remove conditions. To do so is to misuse a process for which it was designed. The accurate planning record shows that these conditions were imposed to ensure, amongst other reasons, the safety of the public put at risk, conditions requirements etc. with current Environment and Climate Change Impacts and Law and compliance with SCC/96/935/122M which is the extant Restoration and After Care Plan. Note that Enforcement Notices are still active and the Developers have not yet complied with the requirement of the Plan.
10. Please arrange for these objections to be added to the cited Applications.
11. Please acknowledge receipt of this letter.

Your sincerely,
Paul Housiaux
Whiston Resident.
26/06/2026

Sent from my iPad

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.staffsmoorlands.gov.uk/YourData>

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.highpeak.gov.uk/YourData>
