**REVEREND PAUL WILSON**

 **(ID: 389717)**

**ADDENDUM TO MY PAPER ON CANTERBURY DISTRICT LDS – 25 JULY 2015**

Now that I’ve received further information from the Council, I wish to make the following additional points:

1. I believe there is no convincing proof that the important ‘LDS at Publication (May 2014)’, as explicitly cited in the Council’s completed Legal Compliance Checklist as evidence of adherence with legal obligations, has ever been formally adopted by the Council.

2. The decision at Thursday’s Full Council Meeting to adopt, in effect retrospectively, the ‘LDS at Submission (Sept 2014)’, again explicitly cited in the Council’s completed Legal Compliance Checklist as evidence of adherence with legal obligations, fails, in my view, to correct the resolution oversight and does not validate the document.

3. LDS documents are designed to convey crucial and authoritative information to the public and other interested parties *at the time* of their release i.e. reflecting the current situation and current hopes re-the progress of the LP. To constitute legal documents meeting the formal LDS requirements and in order to pass the legal compliance test, being addressed and assessed by the Inspector at the present Examination, they needed to be valid when published, an essential prerequisite of that being properly enacted and recorded resolutions of the Council to adopt. In my opinion it is impossible to rerun that process some considerable time after the event.

4. The May 2014 LDS, which was eventually sent electronically to me on 24th July, sets down the same standards and expectations (re-promise to ensure legal compliance of the LP, use of soundness self-assessment tool kit, ensure adequate records and provide robust evidence base) that I referred to in my main paper submitted to the Inspector and to the Examination on 23rd July. It also set out what had supposedly happened and what to anticipate in the future in terms of the involvement of the Local Plan Steering Group and Executive. Constituting the LDS at Publication, i.e. preceding the public consultation on the Local Plan Publication Draft, these claims and expectations, expressed strikingly as ‘risk reduction’, were very important. Crucially they conveyed, in effect, substantial assurances that would have led members of the public and other parties to believe that their potential representations would be processed and handled in a careful manner that involved detailed consideration by the LPSG and accurate reporting to the Executive. Serious questions have been raised regarding those matters. My very recent trawl through the Executive agendas and minutes from September 2012 to the decommissioning of the Executive this year reinforced my own concerns in this regard.

5. The reference to the SCI in the May 2014 LDS would have also reinforced that belief re-consultation being dealt with in an open and fair manner. As in the case of the March 2009 LDS, the May 2014 LDS claims the following: *‘Consultation will be carried out in line with the adopted Statement of Community Involvement (SCI).’* The May 2014 LDS also adds in parenthesis: *‘as amended by changes to relevant regulations’*, although there is no evidence whatsoever that this was ever carried out and indeed the current SCI adopted in 2007 has not been updated to reflect the Localism Act 2011, the 2012 Planning regulations or the NPPF. The latter’s heightened stress, in paras. 69, 150 & 155, on the LP reflecting the community’s vision and aspirations has not been taken on board by the council.

6. Moreover, the second stage consultation was not carried out in line with even the adopted SCI (see paras. 2.4 and 3.1) which led members of the public and other parties to believe that the minimum consultation period would be exceeded. That expectation had been fulfilled and reinforced at the first consultation stage, but requests for more time (even where I was concerned including a second appeal for just 7 extra hours on a Friday evening) to comment on the very extensive documentation at the second stage were curtly rebuffed though the provisions of the SCI were directly cited and appealed to in my own particular case. I have personal email correspondence with the Planning Policy Manager demonstrating all of this was the case (***see separate document)*** and CPRE has also confirmed that it requested an extension of the consultation period.