**REVEREND PAUL WILSON**

**(ID: 389717)**

**COMMENTS BY REV PAUL WILSON LODGED ON 29th JULY**

**ON CCC DUTY TO COOPERATE FILE SUBMITTED BY CCC TO INSPECTOR ON 17th JULY**

**OPENING NOTE:** I've been getting a little confused about the deadlines laid down by the Inspector for comment on extra submissions lodged - partly because not all the Examination notifications have been sent to my sabbatical email address. Hence I may have inadvertently missed the DTC deadline.

**COMMENTS:** Basically, I concur in general with the observations on that massive 400 page Council DTC submission as made by Bob Sellwood/ Pentland Homes. The severe reservations expressed about this data now meeting the DTC requirements are in my view entirely valid.  
This very large file actually somewhat confuses matters. It contains information that has simply arrived too late in the process & indeed the content is sparse in terms of addressing the flaws exposed in the early days of the Examination. The confusion is caused by the fact that the folder cites consultees & reports at length which are not part of the statutory DTC requirements. Some could say this mass of data constitutes a kind of 'smokescreen' which might obscure the reality that essential DTC work was not undertaken in the rigorous & properly minuted fashion which would be normally expected. Evidence is still lacking in key respects e.g. re-the absence of expected agreements with important consultees, including neighbouring LPAs.  
In my opinion, the fundamental flaws in the DTC exercise remain, including the fact that there was not enough DTC fulfilment information in the public domain prior to the formal consultation stages to enable the public to make well-informed responses & indeed there are still substantial gaps. Certain statutory consultees were not properly consulted as came out on day one of the Examination. I believe that the Council ignored the stress put on DTC fulfilment by the Advisory Inspector - advice that was given well in advance.