

**From:** Joanne Mansfield [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 09 June 2023 15:35  
**To:** Tom Dunsdon <tom.dunsdon@bristol.gov.uk>  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]

**Subject:** RE: Stoke Lodge TVG - Inspector's Note (RL01.8)

Dear Mr Dunsdon

The Council, with the exception of the comments made in relation to the statutory incompatibility arguments advanced by Cotham School and the Council, endorses the comments of the Inspector. The only observation that it makes in relation to the substance of the note is that at paragraph 6 the Inspector refers to the two reported cases and only mentions Winterburn. The Council queries whether the Inspector also meant to mention Betterment as the other of the two reported cases referred to.

There is one further matter that the Council would like to address at this time that pertains to the consideration by the committee of the applications on the 28<sup>th</sup> June, and the suggestion by the Applicants that the Registration Authority and the Council have not maintained an appropriate relationship throughout the determination of these applications and that this leads in turn to concerns about pre-determination on the part of the PROWG committee.

In an e-mail to all parties of the 11<sup>th</sup> April Mr Sharland on behalf of the applicants said this:-

“Whilst we agree with Ms Mansfield’s submissions regarding no further comments from the Inspector, we are extremely concerned about her further statement in relation to statutory incompatibility and, in particular, her comment: ‘If this matter is subject to judicial review, it will seek to uphold a decision to reject the application on this alternative basis.’ The clear implication from this is that Ms Mansfield knows that the PROWG will reject the application to register the Land. This raises serious concerns about the alleged ‘Chinese wall’ between the Council qua CRA and Council qua Landowner. It also raises serious concerns about possible predetermination by the Committee.”

The Council rejects completely the suggestion that it has not maintained a professional relationship with the CRA. Throughout the timeline of these applications there has never been any suggestion of concerns about the “Chinese wall” and methodology used by the Council and the CRA to ensure the fair, impartial and arms-length conduct of these applications. It is inappropriate and unprofessional for lawyers to make serious allegations about other lawyers for which there is absolutely no factual basis. This applies to making unjustified inferences from statements made by opposing lawyers. There is nothing about the fact that the Council, as landowner and education authority doing as is suggested by Ms Mansfield (“*if* this matter is subject to judicial review”) that implicitly supports the very serious allegations that have been made.

With no justification whatsoever this allegation attacks the professional integrity of the Council’s lawyer as well as those engaged on behalf of the CRA. Accordingly the Council would request that the CRA invite the applicants to withdraw these comments.

Yours sincerely

Joanne Mansfield  
Lawyer and Team Manager  
Property Planning and Transport team

