

Dear Mr Simister

Reference: Definitive Map Modification LJ665G – Scheduled To Be Determined At The Countryside And Rights Of Way Panel Meeting On 19th March

I have just read and reviewed the papers that have appeared on the Councils website related to definitive map modification application LJ665G. The report and appendices, to be reviewed and decided on by the Countryside and Rights of Way Panel on March 19th, have been published in a way that will create great difficulty for Panel Members to understand and reconcile with the text of the report.

Firstly, the following appendix images have been entered upside down or sideways making them unnecessarily difficult for readers to correlate with the text of the report. Whilst not fatal, placing them in a report in this way just causes unnecessary difficulty for readers:

- Appendix A – Evidence Letter part 2 has been inserted sideways on.
- Appendix C (i) - Deposited Railway Plan has been inserted upside down.
- Appendix C (ii) - Diversion Order Map has been inserted sideways on.
- Appendix C (iii) - Stopping Up Plan has been inserted sideways on.
- Appendix C (vi) - Bacons Map has been inserted upside down.

Most concerningly is the manner in which the final appendix has been presented by Officers which is titled “Letter from Martin Reay, item 4”. There are two aspects related to this appendix which I wish to formally place on record, be brought to the attention of Panel Members and all attendees at next Fridays meeting, by way of a copy of this communication and a verbal explanation by Officers, or the Panel Chairman, before the report for LJ665G is presented to Members:

1. My comments in appendix “item 4”, a copy of which is attached, were submitted to Staffordshire County Council in early August 2020 in response to a draft report I was provided with for application LJ665G. The report that will be presented to Panel Members on 19th March, more than seven months later, has been altered from the draft I reviewed and commented on. Accordingly, the comments I made in appendix “item 4” can no longer be fully reconciled with the modified report that Members have been provided with to determine the application from.
2. The fourteen files I attached, which I referenced in the response to the draft, were all compiled in Portable Network Graphics format. Each had a very clear and concise file name to ensure they were extremely easy to reference with the comments and points I had made. However, Officers have entered the images in appendix “item 4” **without including any of the very clear headings/file names I provided for them**. I have attached just one example illustrating the heading/file name I provided, for an extract of text from an appeal decision served on Staffordshire County Council, by the Secretary of State, directing it to make an order for a former RUPP in the Parish of Alton. This image, along with all others in appendix “item4” have no headings on them at all. To make matters worse the file images I provided have “shuffled up” and not even been entered on appendix “item 4” in the order in which they are referenced in the text of the document. As a consequence it is almost impossible to reconcile the text with the correct image of evidence I provided.

I find it inexcusable for my comments and input to have been presented in such a poor and confusing way. Please, therefore, confirm safe receipt of this email and confirmation that the above matters will be brought to the clear attention of Panel Members in the manner I have requested.

Yours sincerely, Martin Reay