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Dear Sir

Possible Late Representations from Ken Parke Planning Consultants on behalf of the landowner for Policy VTSW4 – North Western Verwood New Neighbourhood

I would like the following situation brought to the attention of the Inspector appointed to Examine the Submitted Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy.

In mid-December 2012 the Council was made aware that Ken Parke Planning Consultants, acting on behalf of the landowner of a potential housing allocation in Verwood, claimed that he had submitted, via an e-mail, a Duly Made Representation to the Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy Pre-Submission Consultation which took place between 2nd April and 25th June 2012. The representation related to a proposal to increase the scale of the residential allocation beyond that indicated in the emerging Core Strategy. The Council had not recorded the Representation as it had no record of ever receiving it.

The Council undertook an exhaustive search of its corporate email records for the time that the email was alleged to have been sent by the agent, but can find no record of the document ever being received in any form. It has records of three other e-mailed Duly Made Representations from the same agent about other policies in the Core Strategy Pre-Submission document, but nothing for the North Western Verwood Site (Policy VTSW4).

Mr Parke does not accept this position, as he states that the representation was sent to the Council within the consultation timescale and should therefore be registered as Duly Made.

The Council does not agree with Mr Parke, as it does not consider an assertion from an agent that the representation was sent to be substantial enough to warrant accepting as Duly Made a representation received 6 months after the close of the consultation. It also argues that to do so would prejudice other respondents whose comments were received after the close of the consultation and have not been recorded as Duly Made.

However, following numerous discussions and correspondence with the agent, the landowner concerned, Lead Members and senior Officers since December, Mr Parke and the landowner have been informed that the Council will make the Inspector aware that there is a dispute over whether or not the representation was Duly Made.

Yours faithfully,

Judith Plumley

Head of Community and Economy

Christchurch and East Dorset Councils