

Planning

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 16 June 2026 20:06
To: Planning
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: TP/ED/26/0104 | Objections with regard to "Public reports pack 18062026 1400 Community Planning Partnership Board."
Attachments: For EDC Critique post _Public reports pack 18062026 1400 Community Planning Partnership Board.__ - Sheet1.pdf

[REDACTED]

I have been reading this document with disbelief and astonishment , "*Public reports pack 18062026 1400 Community Planning Partnership Board.*"

How is it possible for EDC to adopt the positions in this document, then act the way they are acting with regard to WGP?

The CPP Board and Draft Greenspace Strategy explicitly promise to ..."**Engage and empower communities through participatory approaches**".

In reality, the public were excluded from any meaningful consultation on site selection and are currently engaged in a Kafkaesque dance with the council regarding access to title deeds and the original 70s /80s planning application.

I think you and [REDACTED] should know about this; it is a practical example of what the council must have discussed the other night.

We now know that the site is bisected by fragmented, undisclosed titles (such as the British Rail / SDA land and "Scottish Ministers' parcels referred to in EDC documents").

We know that the planning application's redline boundary is unverified.

Instead of empowering the community, the Council is attempting to levy prohibitive search fees for documents *it has not even confirmed it has* and seems to be withholding already compiled corporate property deeds.

I would assert that unfairly using financial and bureaucratic barriers to starve a community of the data needed to scrutinise this huge project completely invalidates the Council's "participatory" claims and demonstrates "systemic procedural unfairness".

The public have pointed out dozens of issues in the documents that the highly paid consultants and indeed internal departments have missed.

I would assert that it is clear that the council's actions are in complete breach of the spirit of both the EIR regulations and the Community Empowerment Act.

The council should be embracing the community and working with it, not frustrating it.

I can see that the allocation for the year 26/27 for contractors and officials works out at £5,000 per working day, whereas the community is working for free for the Council.

I wish to formally add these objections to TP/ED/26/0104.

I have used my usual format, mapping each objection to the relevant legislation. I trust this makes things easier for you.

Once again, I request that you supply a file detailing your position on each item.

Once again, I am copying [REDACTED] in the interests of information flow.

[REDACTED]