

From: Adrian Verrall [REDACTED]
Sent: 18 July 2014 15:53
To: 'Rev Paul Wilson'
Subject: RE: IMPORTANT Queries re-Barham Court Farm Housing Allocation & site 206 South Canterbury plus Requests for Information

Hello, Rev Wilson

I'm sorry, but we cannot extend the consultation period.

Regards.

Adrian Verrall
Planning Policy Manager
Canterbury City Council

From: Rev Paul Wilson [REDACTED]
Sent: 18 July 2014 15:52
To: Adrian Verrall
Subject: RE: IMPORTANT Queries re-Barham Court Farm Housing Allocation & site 206 South Canterbury plus Requests for Information

Thank you, Adrian.

I appreciate your answers & the trouble taken to reply.

Any word on whether I can have until 11.59pm to submit my representations? A speedy reply would be so very greatly appreciated.

Warm regards,
Rev Paul

From: Rev Paul Wilson [REDACTED]
Sent: 17 July 2014 17:36
To: 'Adrian Verrall'
Subject: RE: Query re- website maintenance & disquiet about LPPD matters

Thank you, Adrian,

Yes, I did realise what you'd said earlier about needing time to collect together the data requested, but did feel that a progress statement on that would've been helpful & appropriate.

Like quite a number of folk I simply wish via a critique of the current version of the LP to help encourage the emergence of a better Plan that would fulfil & embody the community's vision.

I trust you might accept that outlook & I know you & your team have put an enormous amount of work into the LP project so far. However, I would still strongly contend that much of it has been premature, in the absence of associated studies, & is still being rushed through. Moreover, in all honesty, I'm not alone in fearing that stronger powers have somewhat hijacked the exercise & the goal & that retro-fitting has occurred to justify the chosen end result.

As I've observed before, I recognise the mammoth task involved & you deserve substantial credit for dealing with the public with good grace & openness most of the time. Though I've been truly shocked about the lack of note-taking re-the really important aspects of the duty to cooperate & the liaising with developers. Hence I & others have been affected by the consequent delay in accessing basic data in relation to those aspects & this has directly impinged on our representations at this stage..

Overall, I've just been trying to untangle the process that has led us to a situation where as Councillor Perkins neatly put it "*the community has the sense of being done to, rather than done with*" &, to be even-handed politically, to the situation where as Councillor Ashley Clarke roughly put it "*after the first military-style skirmish a modified & more successful Plan can emerge – for few plans survive the first encounter*".

I will of course endeavour to submit by tomorrow's deadline but more time would've helped enormously & quite a few folk have expressed that to me.

Regarding the issue of the duration of the consultation period the Cabinet Office '*Code of Practice on Consultation*' indicates the following general recommendations:

Criterion 2 **Duration of consultation exercises**

Consultations should normally last for at least 12 weeks with consideration given to longer timescales where feasible and sensible.

- 21** Under normal circumstances, consultations should last for a minimum of 12 weeks. This should be factored into project plans for policy development work. Allowing at least 12 weeks will help enhance the quality of the responses. This is because many organisations will want to consult the people they represent or work with before drafting a response to Government and to do so takes time.
- 22** If a consultation exercise is to take place over a period when consultees are less able to respond, e.g. over the summer or Christmas break, or if the policy under consideration is particularly complex, consideration should be given to the feasibility of allowing a longer period for the consultation.¹⁸

Is there any chance whatsoever of having at least until the end of Friday i.e. 11.59pm tomorrow?

I look forward to the Examination & to encountering you & your team in that context!

Warm regards, Paul

From: Adrian Verrall [REDACTED]

Sent: 17 July 2014 16:54

To: 'Rev Paul Wilson'

Subject: RE: Query re- website maintenance & disquietr about LPPD matters

Hello, Rev Wilson

Just on your point about the web-site, I understand that the maintenance work only affects the Planning Applications web-pages. It does not involve our part of the web-site.

In relation to the "duty to cooperate", I did mention in my initial e-mail that where such papers exist, it would take some time to deal with this, especially as some would require the permission of other organisations. We are still dealing with this, but you can raise the point about the duty to cooperate in your comments anyway if you wish.

As far as the SA work is concerned, I would say that the assessment worksheets are available on the web-site, either on the [evidence base documents page](#) or on the [SA consultation page](#). If you feel the analysis is incorrect, you can include that in your comments.

In relation to your specific questions about the SA, the SHLAA proposals have been submitted over the last 5 years or so, and the site visits have taken place over a similar time period. At each stage of the SA process, Amec have asked us to provide specific information about the sites, and this is the information contained in the worksheets. At each stage, they have been given the information so that they could include their conclusions in their reports. We have then added the site worksheets to the web-site for the last two consultations.

In relation to the consultation period, we have provided 6 weeks for comments. This is adequate time to submit comments and we can see no reason to extend the time period. Others have been able to get their comments in on time and have been able to do so with the information available. A lot of the information has been in the public domain for significantly longer than that, committee reports etc. having been available ahead of the Executive meeting on 10 April 2014. Many of the evidence base

reports and proposed allocations have been in the public domain since the last consultation in June 2013, and some even before that.

I have just seen your latest e-mail, and will try to respond to that first thing tomorrow.

Regards.

Adrian Verrall
Planning Policy Manager
Canterbury City Council

From: Rev Paul [REDACTED]
Sent: 16 July 2014 17:00
To: Adrian Verrall
Subject: Query re- website maintenance & disquiet about LPPD matters

Dear Adrian,

Can I ask for your reassurance that the essential maintenance work on the website (apparently restricted to planning applications search at the moment) will not interfere with the submission of second stage consultation representations being lodged over the next 48 hours. I know folk are worried about this matter.

I also wish to register my disquiet regarding the following:

1. The absence of any recent courtesy email so far regarding my request for duty to cooperate information in advance of submitting my next representation on the present version of the Plan – especially concerning now with the deadline rapidly running out! And this despite the clear expectation on the part of PINS that such information should & would be made available. Relevant correspondence to you dating back to 24th June attached. Plus, please note that Stephen Carnaby of PINS Local Plans Team gave me the following reassurance *“I assume, that if they say they will send you the material that you request, then they will do so.”*
2. The failure to reply to date to my enquiry of 11th July which also affects my ability to make a fully considered response re-the Amec SA & its relationship to the final site selection. Relevant correspondence again attached here.

3. The instant dismissal of appeals by myself & others for an extension of the consultation deadline & the rather curt & unexplained “The consultation period cannot be extended”. Why not? Under the Nolan rules, defined by the Committee for Standards in Public Life members of the public are entitled to reasons – see below/ rules 4 & 5:

- **Accountability** Holders of public office are accountable for their decisions and actions to the public and must submit themselves to whatever scrutiny is appropriate to their office.
- **Openness** Holders of public office should be as open as possible about all the decisions and actions that they take. They should give reasons for their decisions and restrict information only when the wider public interest clearly demands it.

I've been very grateful for your helpfulness in the past, but these are very real concerns, particularly at a critical timer when I'm doing my best to complete my representations.

Warm regards,

Paul

From: Adrian Verrall [REDACTED]
Sent: 11 July 2014 16:42
To: 'Rev Paul Wilson'
Subject: RE: APPEAL FOR EXTENSION OF CONSULTATION PERIOD

Dear Rev. Wilson

The consultation period cannot be extended. However, this should not prevent you making whatever comments you wish on the content of the draft Plan, particularly the changes you are seeking. You may also raise the issues below in your comments if you wish.

Regards.

Adrian Verrall
Planning Policy Manager
Canterbury City Council

From: Rev Paul Wilson [REDACTED]
Sent: 10 July 2014 15:15
To: Adrian Verrall
Subject: APPEAL FOR EXTENSION OF CONSULTATION PERIOD

Dear Adrian,

I am contacting you to humbly & formally request an extension to the consultation period on the Local Plan Publication Draft & the other associated reports, which runs out on 18th July (i.e. only 8 days away now).

In support of this request I'd wish to cite the following:

- 1) **I have requested & still await essential information (minutes & notes of duty to cooperate meetings – none of which I've received to date except one PowerPoint presentation), which I also now know the Advisory Inspector had expected to be in the public domain by this stage, along with published data re-discussions with landowners & developers.** All of that to enable the Council to demonstrate in a transparent fashion its compliance with the duty to cooperate & related requirements. As far as local residents are concerned, the necessary insight to judge adequately the legal compliance & soundness of the Plan & the ability to thus make reasoned representations are both seriously impaired in the absence of such basic information regarding the liaising with statutory bodies & developers. This reflects a key point the Advisory Inspector made in the crucial context of the need to demonstrate viability,
viz.:

(2) Canterbury Council needs to provide credible evidence in the public domain which supports the viability of its plan and proposals. It may need to go back to landowners/developers to agree what can be published, if leaving out the confidential data means that viability cannot be demonstrated. The plan examination is of course a public matter.

Jill Kingaby
Jan 2014

- 2) **I think some doubt could still be expressed about whether the Advisory Inspector's other explicit advice about viability & deliverability, including infrastructure swapping & green infrastructure, have been fully addressed in the latest version of the Plan. Plus the failure to publish as yet the 2013 Adams Integra Viability Report, which is actually cited as evidence in the LPPD (paras. xxiii/2.40/2.42/8.49 on pages 9,47,48&181), is a serious matter that needs to be urgently addressed as it impinges very directly again on the ability of members of the public to make reasoned judgements &**

lodge well-informed & rigorously- researched representations at present. A summary or report of that document is not enough.

- 3) **The sheer amount of work required to respond thoughtfully & adequately to all the present & important consultations (the Sustainability Appraisal being 567 pages in itself!) within the 6 week period is quite simply overwhelming.** I note the following statement from the 2007 Statement of Community Involvement: *'Although the new planning system sets statutory minimum requirements for consultation, there is a clear expectation that planning authorities seek to exceed these'* (page 15). The coincidence of these multiple consultations is rather unfair & unreasonable within such a tight time-frame!
- 4) **The continued confusion over the use of the vitally important MORI poll** – as to whether the Council believes 'some' or 'many' local people back its current development proposals in the LP does need to be cleared up (in view of the confused references I pointed out to you earlier). The basically unchanged Plan continues to be fundamentally premised on the bold assertion that it was supported by 'many' local residents (paras. xxi & 3.29) i.e. that it represents the community's wishes. The strong expression of disquiet about the misrepresentation of the MORI poll & the opposition to the Council's development blueprint, as expressed in the large number of objecting representations at the first stage consultation (on the POLP), totally undermines that assertion.
- 5) **The fact that the Joint Transportation Board has not yet met to discuss either the LP or the Transport Strategy!**

I trust you & other senior officers will take these considerations into account. I will also notify the Inspectorate of this request.

Warm regards,
Paul