

**Public Examination 2014**

**Friends of Speckled Wood Management Trust and HMRC Registered Charity Statement.**

**ID/8**

**REPID2163.**

The High Court Case: Hunstan Properties Ltd v Secretary of State for Communities and local Government [2013] EWHC 2678 (Admin) Judgement was referred to the Inspector in several of the Hearings and is pertinent to the Inspectors Note ID 8. The Case deals with a development on the boundary of the Woodland which was fought by the developers repeatedly, eventually being upheld in regard to no development. I believe it rules out the benefit the Council suggests in their statements that housing will bring to an allocation area on the border of woodland.

You will recall I provided you a copy of the Kent County Councils Property Planning Law Update now here Exhibit REP2164-100:

[http://www.kent.gov.uk/\\_data/assets/pdf\\_file/0007/9583/property-planning-law-update6.pdf](http://www.kent.gov.uk/_data/assets/pdf_file/0007/9583/property-planning-law-update6.pdf), which referenced a High Court Judgement in regard to building on Woodland.

You may recall this was handed to the Inspector. It referenced the High Court Case: Hunstan Properties Ltd v Secretary of State for Communities and local Government [2013] EWHC 2678 (Admin) News Overview

[http://www.39essex.com/resources/news\\_listing.php?id=329](http://www.39essex.com/resources/news_listing.php?id=329),

Case Law

Exhibit 2164-101 <http://www.bailii.org/ew/cases/EWHC/Admin/2013/2678.html>

If this case information provided by Kent County Council on its website is to demonstrate and prevent protracted Legal Challenge when dealing with matters like ID/8. I would imagine this should be the same Legal route adopted by Hastings Borough Council. If this is the case ID/8 would not appear to cover the matter completely and there is a need to take this High Court Judgement into consideration.