

Draft Statement of Community Involvement

Public Participation Report

Introduction

Introduction

Representations

Nature Summary of Main Issue

Council's Assessment

Action

Introduction

Introduction

21955

Comment Our objection refers to the proposed development, referred to as site reference RV20b - the decision to build dwellings at the end of Hambrook Close, Great Whelnetham. Your website fulsomely praises yourselves, using buzzwords such as 'transparent' and 'holistic' but the whole website is couched in incomprehensible 'council-speak' which means precisely you want it to mean. We believe that this is a dishonest document. The only reason for submitting this response is to preclude you from stating that "no-one objected to the draft Statement of Community Involvement". We object and we shall continue to do so.

This representation relates to the St Edmundsbury Vision 2031 document as opposed to the content of the SCI.

No change to SCI required.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
21949	Comment	<p>I thank you for your letter of 11th October 2013 and respond to the proposals as follows:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I agree with the areas selected for large scale expansion although they have been resisted by all the local adjacent inhabitants, however, why were small areas on the perimeter, which were very suitable for development rejected in the "due process"? It defys common sense. 2. I understand that footpaths, cycleways and services for new developments were omitted as they would be dependent on the layouts selected for the developments. 3. The developments will change the character of the town very considerably and the present almost total dependence on cars will have to change. Unfortunately Bury's expansion after the war never was designed, but, like Topsy, just grew round the existing town. 4. After the WW2 the main London satellite towns were designed and built from scratch. A look at these now might help. 5. If Bury is provided with an efficient rail service growth will be accelerated. Has any allowance been made for this. 6. Red Lodge is undergoing considerable development & is capable of much more. It is an "Edge town" and need rationalisation and allowed to develop now. It would ease the pressure on BSE. 7. The BT old switch Hous building opposite the United Reform Church is presumably part of the property of the Post Office, recently privatised. It is probable that it will be demolished and replaced with apartments or hotel or whatever, in due course. 8. I hope this helps. 	The response provided did not relate to the Subject matter of the SCI.	No change to SCI required.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
21981	Comment	Natural England is a non-departmental public body. Our statutory purpose is to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development. We are supportive of the principle of meaningful and early engagement of the general community, community organisations and statutory bodies in local planning matters, both in terms of shaping policy and participating in the process of determining planning applications.	Comment(s) noted.	No change to SCI required.
21960	Comment	This is an officer level response and is made without prejudice. Norfolk County Council in its capacity as the Mineral and Waste Planning Authority for Norfolk has no specific comments to make in relation to the above consultation.	Comment(s) noted.	No change to SCI required.
21954	Comment	Our objection refers to the proposed development, referred to as site reference RV20b - the decision to build dwellings at the end of Hambrook Close, Great Whelnetham. Your website fulsomely praises yourselves, using buzzwords such as 'transparent' and 'holistic' but the whole website is couched in incomprehensible 'council-speak' which means precisely you want it to mean. We believe that this is a dishonest document. The only reason for submitting this response is to preclude you from stating that "no-one objected to the draft Statement of Community Involvement". We object and we shall continue to do so.	This representation relates to the St Edmundsbury Vision 2031 document as opposed to the content of the SCI.	No change to content of SCI required.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Part 1 Plan Making</i>				
<i>1.1 How we produce our Local Plan documents</i>				
21859	Comment	The Statement of Community Involvement cannot proceed until the Core Strategy, adopted in December 2010 is re-visited and corrected. The villages that had their Houseing Settlement Boundaries removed should have been consulted which was a Statutory Requirement. In the case of our village of Hargrave this process was not carried out and was therefore illegal. Mr Griffiths (Leader of the Council) has consistently refused to advise me who advised him that a consultation took place so what have the Borough Council to hide ?	The representation relates to the development of a previous Local Plan document, (procedural issue), rather than the content of the SCI itself.	No change to SCI required.
21963	Comment	The last presentation of documents at the Apex was very poor - not enough space for people to get near the documents, not enough copies for the number of people at any one time, documents too small for anything other than one person at a time.	Comments noted as they relate to arrangements at a previous exhibition/consultation.	No change to SCI required.
<i>1.2 How we produce our Supplementary Planning Documents</i>				
21959	Comment	No reference is made to CIL within the draft SCI. Knowing that CIL has not yet been implemented within either local authority, consideration should be given for the inclusion of a section on CIL. Such a section could be incorporated after point 1.2 ('How we produce our Supplementary Planning Documents').	It is not considered that a reference to CIL is required as it is not directly related to the preparation of the Local Plan for either Authority or the planning application process.	No change to SCI required.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
------------------------	---------------	------------------------------	-----------------------------	---------------

1.3 How we plan strategically across local boundaries

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
21964	Comment	<p>1) References to Suffolk County Council as a consultee are welcomed.</p> <p>2) Paragraph 1.3, on the Duty to Cooperate, could be expanded upon to reflect the Government's draft National Planning Policy Guidance which, though draft, can be considered as a strong indicator of the Government's general policy direction.</p> <p>3) The reference to 'NHS Suffolk' (page 15) is incorrect, as no such organisation exists following the recent NHS reforms. The functions of this organisation have been split between NHS England, the Clinical Commissioning Groups and Suffolk County Council.</p> <p>4) To ensure that there is proper consultation on primary health infrastructure (General Practitioners, etc), NHS England; the property division of which has responsibility for engaging with the planning system for the purposes of infrastructure delivery; should be listed above the local Clinical Commissioning Groups. Please also note also that the Ipswich and East Suffolk CCG covers part of the West Suffolk area</p> <p>5) It may be also useful to have a clear reference to the two Local Enterprise Partnerships; New Anglia and Greater Cambridge Greater Peterborough; and the Homes and Communities Agency as important partner bodies prescribed in the duty to co-operate.</p> <p>6) This document could set out, for both authorities, a commitment to producing accessible documents which use clear and plain English, and avoiding jargon wherever possible. Also important is the 'navigability' of the range of planning documents.</p> <p>7) County Councillors have raised the issue of ensuring that the interrelationships between Core Strategy, Site Allocations, Development Management Policies, Supplementary Planning Documents and Guidance are clear.</p> <p>8) County Councillors have also raised the issue of the reporting of consultee comments to District and Borough Councillors, as they consider Local Plan documents and Planning Applications. Whilst it is difficult to process and consolidate consultee comments such that they are concise enough to be reported in a usable form, it should be the stated aim of the two councils to commit to striking a balance.</p>	<p>1) Comment noted,</p> <p>2) It is considered that the reference to the duty to co-operate is adequate,</p> <p>3) Agreed - reference to NHS Suffolk should be removed,</p> <p>4) Agreed - Reference should be made to NHS England. There should also be a Reference to the East Suffolk Clinical Commissioning Group.</p> <p>5) It is considered that the reference to those bodies we will seek to engage with under the duty to co-operate is adequate.</p> <p>6) The Councils work with their Communications Team to ensure all documents are legible to the widest possible audience. It is not considered that reference to this fact is required within the context of the SCI.</p> <p>7) Comment noted.</p> <p>8) Comment noted.</p>	<p>3) Reference to NHS Suffolk to be removed,</p> <p>4) Include references to NHS England, (Property Services) and to the East Suffolk Clinical Commissioning Group.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
21984	Comment	Page 14 point 1.3 clearer definition esp. last sentence	It is considered that the text provided is appropriate.	No change to SCI required.
21950	Comment	<p>It is suggested that section 1.3 of the SCI document be expanded to include some further detail:</p> <p>1) Strategic priorities for local authorities to co-operate upon, as detailed within paragraph 156 of the NPPF.</p> <p>2) Specify the bodies in which the local authority must cooperate with, as defined by Part 2 (section 4) of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations, 2012.</p> <p>3) In addition, the Council considers that Section 1.4 of the document could be expanded upon to provide a comprehensive table which details specific, general and local consultees for engagement within the planning process. This table could form an appendix to the SCI document.</p> <p>4) It is acknowledged that Breckland Council is a specific consultation body for the purposes of preparing your Local Plan; however, we would like to take this opportunity to reinforce the importance of cooperation and joint working and would welcome discussions on issues where cross border implications may occur between both local authorities.</p>	<p>1) It is not considered necessary to include a reference to the 'strategic priorities' as they appear at para. 156 of the NPPF. It is considered that the nature of our requirements as they relate to the duty to co-operate are adequately referenced at section 1.3, p.14.</p> <p>2) It is considered that those bodies that we are required to engage with as part of our 'duty-to-co-operate' are adequately referenced at section 1.3, (p.14), of the SCI.</p> <p>3) Although not exhaustive, the list of statutory and other key 'local' consultees as identified in section 1.4, (p.15), is considered adequate.</p> <p>4) The Councils recognise the importance of co-operation and cross-border working with neighbouring Authorities and this is recognised within the context of the SCI.</p>	<p>1) No change to SCI required.</p> <p>2) No change to SCI required.</p> <p>3) No change to SCI required.</p> <p>4) No change to SCI required.</p>
21951	Comment	Generally welcome the SCI and in particular reference in section 1.3 to the Duty to Cooperate. It might be sensible to expand this section to make specific reference to those authorities which will be consulted under the provisions of the Localism Act (Duty to Cooperate) i.e. make reference to neighbouring authorities such as Norfolk County Council etc.	It is considered that reference to our duty to co-operate is appropriate and the SCI adequately references our requirement to work collaboratively with 'all partners' to ensure that sustainability objectives are met in the preparation of our development plans. The SCI also makes specific reference to joint-working arrangements with our neighbouring Authorities albeit we did not consider it necessary to name them all.	No change to SCI required.
<i>1.4 Our methods for community engagement</i>				
21961	Comment	Needs more publicity to reach people. The on-line response forms exclude many people by the complexity of the process.	Although we encourage use of the on-line representation facility during consultation periods, hardcopies of the consultation documents are made available and written representations are accepted. Our methods for publicising the consultations are identified in table 1, (p.16/17), and these are considered extensive and appropriate.	No change to SCI required.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
21851	Comment	Reading this it looks like you will present ready made plans to people and are looking for them to comment to support the proposals. You are writing about engaging but that means letting go, letting communities take decisions about where they live however the message from this document is that you want to stay in control. This is not encouraging communities to work with you and will simply produce more conflict.	The purpose of the SCI is to explain how we engage with our communities and also to explain how groups and individuals can become more involved in the planning process. There is also an explanation of the 'Neighbourhood Plans' process, (para. 1.5, p.18), and contact details for those seeking 'independent' planning advice, (i.e. not from the Council Officers themselves), Part 4, p.28.	No changes to the SCI required.
21968	Comment	NHSPS welcomes the inclusion of the NHS within the 'Local Plan Contact List' of those organisations/groups to be consulted on draft Local Development Documents. 1) However, in light of its advisory role to both NHSE and West Suffolk CCG, NHS Property Services Ltd should be listed as the appropriate NHS body to be consulted by the Councils on Local Development Document matters. 2) It should also be noted that part of St Edmundsbury Borough Council is covered by Ipswich and East Suffolk CCG. 3) NHS Suffolk should be removed from the list of contacts as this organisation ceased operating on 31/03/2013.	1) Agreed that NHS England (Property Services) should be identified as the appropriate body for consultation purposes. 2) Agreed that reference should be made to Ipswich and East Suffolk CCG in addition to the Western Suffolk CCG. 3) Agreed. Reference to NHS Suffolk should be removed.	1) Identify NHS England (Property Services) as a consultee, 2) Reference East Suffolk CCG in addition to the Western Suffolk CCG. 3) Remove reference to NHS Suffolk.
21850	Comment	Using this online method of collecting representations will cut down the number of people engaging. It is confusing and requires a good level of reading and computer skills for people to be able to use it so may increase the inequality and also frustration with people thinking you possibly don't want them to comment.	Comment noted which does not relate to the content of the SCI. Hardcopies of our consultation documents are made available to view and written representations are accepted albeit we do encourage the use of the on-line representation facility.	No action required.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
21965	Comment	<p>1) References to Suffolk County Council as a consultee are welcomed.</p> <p>2) Paragraph 1.3, on the Duty to Cooperate, could be expanded upon to reflect the Government's draft National Planning Policy Guidance which, though draft, can be considered as a strong indicator of the Government's general policy direction.</p> <p>3) The reference to 'NHS Suffolk' (page 15) is incorrect, as no such organisation exists following the recent NHS reforms. The functions of this organisation have been spilt between NHS England, the Clinical Commissioning Groups and Suffolk County Council.</p> <p>4) To ensure that there is proper consultation on primary health infrastructure (General Practitioners, etc), NHS England; the property division of which has responsibility for engaging with the planning system for the purposes of infrastructure delivery; should be listed above the local Clinical Commissioning Groups. Please also note also that the Ipswich and East Suffolk CCG covers part of the West Suffolk area</p> <p>5) It may be also useful to have a clear reference to the two Local Enterprise Partnerships; New Anglia and Greater Cambridge Greater Peterborough; and the Homes and Communities Agency as important partner bodies prescribed in the duty to co-operate.</p> <p>6) This document could set out, for both authorities, a commitment to producing accessible documents which use clear and plain English, and avoiding jargon wherever possible. Also important is the 'navigability' of the range of planning documents.</p> <p>7) County Councillors have raised the issue of ensuring that the interrelationships between Core Strategy, Site Allocations, Development Management Policies, Supplementary Planning Documents and Guidance are clear.</p> <p>8) County Councillors have also raised the issue of the reporting of consultee comments to District and Borough Councillors, as they consider Local Plan documents and Planning Applications. Whilst it is difficult to process and consolidate consultee comments such that they are concise enough to be reported in a usable form, it should be the stated aim of the two councils to commit to striking a balance.</p>	<p>1) Comment noted,</p> <p>2) It is considered that the reference to the duty to co-operate is adequate,</p> <p>3) Agreed - reference to NHS Suffolk should be removed,</p> <p>4) Agreed - References to NHS England and the East Suffolk CCG should be included.</p> <p>5) It is considered that the reference to those bodies we will seek to engage with under the duty to co-operate is adequate.</p> <p>6) The Councils work with their Communications Team to ensure all documents are legible to the widest possible audience. It is not considered that reference to this fact is required within the context of the SCI.</p> <p>7) Comment noted.</p> <p>8) Comment noted.</p>	<p>3) Reference to NHS Suffolk to be removed,</p> <p>4) Reference to be made to NHS England (Property Services) and East Suffolk CCG.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
21985	Comment	<p>1) Page 15 point 1.4 "will try" - to what lengths? 2) Page 15 Table 1 is e-mail an appropriate tool for consultation, most such documents are lengthy therefore not appropriate to read on a computer. Locally published newsletter/magazines should be used, as mentioned on page 17</p>	<p>1) It is considered that the statement 'will try to engage with' is appropriate given the context, (it will not always be necessary/possible to engage with all groups at all times). The methods, (or 'lengths' to which we will go), to engage are identified in table 1. 2) Table 1 describes a range of possible methods of community engagement. Not all methods will be used at all times although it is considered that e-mail is an appropriate tool for consultation at appropriate times/stages. Other methods of communication will be utilised as appropriate, including the use of newsletters.</p>	No change to SCI required.
21980	Comment	<p>1) Council staff would benefit seminar in best practice in consultation 2) Not everyone has email 3) Councillors should receive regular reports on issues raised in consultation exercises 4) Consultation exercise to be divided into two groups - population at large and other groups with an interest Various consultation methods suggested are 5) Referenda 6) Focus groups 7) General meetings 8) Drop-in sessions 9) General invitation</p>	<p>1) It is considered that the council staff do keep abreast of best practice as it relates to appropriate consultation and community engagement. 2) It is recognised that not all consultees have e-mail and for this reason hardcopies of literature are disseminated and it is possible to submit written representations. 3) Councillors do receive consultation 'reports' at key stages in the development of a Local Plan document. 4) It is not considered that 'dividing' the consultation is appropriate, effective or cost-effective. 5) As suggested, referendums are costly and time consuming processes and not considered appropriate in the development of Local Plan documents. 6/7/8) The Councils will seek to utilise 'focus groups', 'general meetings' and/or 'drop-in sessions' at appropriate stages, (see table 1). 9) Various 'representative groups' feature on the local plan mailing list and their involvement in the consultation process is actively encouraged. All groups on the mailing list are informed of upcoming consultations in a timely manner.</p>	No change(s) to SCI required.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
21967	Comment	I would like to take this opportunity to say that Anglian Water welcomes consultation on LDF documents and planning applications and is keen to work with and support St Edmundsbury Borough and Forest Heath District Council in their Growth aspirations. We are keen to respond to all LDF document consultations and all major (10+) planning applications and other applications where there may be concerns or issues relating to drainage.	Comment(s) noted	No change to SCI required
21939	Comment	Please ensure that Linton Parish Council is named as a statutory consultee.	The Parish Councils are identified as one of our consultees, (1.5, p.15).	No change to SCI required.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
21966	Comment	<p>Paragraph 1.4:</p> <p>1) Re.(b):There should be a comma or semi-colon after the first "Councils" in line 2.This is for clarity.</p> <p>2) Re.(c): Similarly,after the first "Council".</p> <p>3) The contact list needs to be updated at intervals,after suitable publicity inviting new applicants to join the list.</p> <p>4) The organisations list should include an independent Advocate,versed in environmental law and regulations and government advice,whose task would be to articulate the rights and interests of ordinary residents of Forest Heath.</p> <p>5) A wide variety of consultation methods are described in the document,and some of them are recommended.Where the topic for public consultation is of the greatest significance-such as the Local Plan Submission Document-there are two important principles:</p> <p>1.The consultation should be with the widest possible population-the target should be the total electorate.</p> <p>2.The publicity should be very wide and very clear,with clear and large signage,in many prominent places.In other words,publicity should be such that public awareness would become inevitable-it would be difficult to MISS the publicity.</p> <p>6) The language used in all documentation should be clear,unambiguous,non-contradictory,and subject only to normal interpretation.</p> <p>7) Conditions for study of the draft documents should be favourable in the various locations e.g.adequate seating and location.</p> <p>8) ALL documents due for submission,including the Sustainability Appraisal,should be available for study in paper form and in all the various locations.</p>	<p>1) It is not considered that the suggested amendment is required,</p> <p>2) It is not considered that the suggested amendment is required,</p> <p>3) The Local Plan mailing list is regularly updated.</p> <p>4) It is not considered that employing an independent advocate is appropriate. All documents that are produced are done so in accordance with planning law and the appropriate regulations/legislation. The documents are also tested at the examination stage for their 'soundness' and to ensure that they are legally compliant.There is an address provided in part 4 of the document for those seeking 'independent' planning advice.</p> <p>5) It is considered that our methods for engaging with our communities are both extensive and appropriate given our available resources, (see table 1).</p> <p>6) The planning team engages the communications team in the production of the Local Plan literature to ensure that it is legible to the widest possible audience.</p> <p>7) It is considered that the locations for viewing consultation material are suitable and accessible.</p> <p>8) All consultation versions of Local Plan documents, including the SA/SEA, are made available in hardcopy at our principal offices and within local libraries.</p>	No changes to SCI required.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
21958	Comment	<p>1) Under section 1.4 (Our methods for community engagement), the third paragraph states the following "Specifically, the Councils will try to engage with:". There are statutory requirements to consult with particular parts of the community, such as Parish and Town Councils, and 'statutory consultees'. Accordingly, it may be more appropriate to remove the words 'try to' so that the sentence reads "Specifically, the Councils will engage with:", which would be received more positively.</p> <p>2) Reference to neighbouring County Councils as part of the consultation process is well received.</p> <p>3) No reference is made to CIL within the draft SCI. Knowing that CIL has not yet been implemented within either local authority, consideration should be given for the inclusion of a section on CIL. Such a section could be incorporated after point 1.2 ('How we produce our Supplementary Planning Documents'). CIL requirements do not form part of a SPD, but would be included in the suite of documents supporting the Local Plan. However, the levy could only be implemented where there is an up-to-date Local Plan, which accords with the NPPF (Paragraph 175). The DCLG Community Infrastructure Levy guidance states under paragraph 48 that "Collaboration with County Councils is important, not only in setting the levy rate (or rates), but also in agreeing priorities for how the levy will be spent in two-tier areas, where they are responsible for delivery of key strategic infrastructure." Although Cambridgeshire County Council are not within the administrative area of St Edmundsbury District Council and Forest Heath District Council, there may well be cross-boundary infrastructure priorities which require addressing through the CIL consultation process. In addition, the 'Duty to Co-operate' requirement stipulated within the Localism Act 2011 would also be a factor in this regard. This is also referred to within section 1.3 of the draft SCI.</p> <p>The consultation arrangements within CIL are identified within paragraphs 46 - 50 of the CIL guidance, and could be referred to should CIL be included within the SCI. Furthermore, the draft charging schedule is subject to public examination, which would require appropriate levels of consultation.</p>	<p>1) It is not considered that the terminology requires an amendment. Not all groups identified are statutory consultees, (we will make every attempt to engage with the groups identified on page 15 but this will not always be a requirement).</p> <p>2) Comment noted.</p> <p>3) It is not considered that a specific reference to the CIL is a requirement as it does not constitute one of our Local Plan documents.</p>	No changes to SCI required.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		Again, this supports the possible inclusion of a separate section on CIL within the draft SCI. The inclusion of CIL has been used within SCIs elsewhere at different LPAs. An example of this is Walsall District Council's SCI (2012), Chapter 6.		
21957	Comment	The Highways Agency supports the consultation approach within the Draft Statement and notes we are listed as a statutory consultee in Para 1.4. We have no further comment to make.	Comment(s) noted.	No change to SCI required.
<i>1.5 Supporting the Neighbourhood Planning process</i>				
21986	Comment	Page 18 point 1.5 - does this mean there will be constant revision of the process?	No, page 18, (section 1.5), relates to the neighbourhood planning procedures. It does not mean that our methods for community involvement in our planning functions will be subject to 'constant revision'.	No change to SCI required.
21849	Comment	Parish Councils are not involved early enough in the planning process and the weighting of their opinion is not high enough - so whatever we say is easily overridden by the planners. Ideally, the Parish Council needs to be involved as soon as a planning application is received and our support or objection to the application given sufficient weighting to actually influence the application outcome. Also, where a planning application is in conflict with the local plan or Vision 2031 then the Parish should be consulted and have sufficient input to the process to influence the outcome.	The Parish Councils are notified as soon as is reasonably practicable following receipt of a planning application and their views must be taken into account by the case officer as this influences the way that they progress the application, (i.e. how it is dealt with within the context of the scheme of delegation). Planning Officers actively encourage developers to engage with Parish Councils as part of the pre-application process and this is reflected within the context of the SCI, section 2.1, p.19.	No change to SCI required.
21852	Comment	I am concerned that the document Rural Vision 2031 which is a desktop exercise not involving communities is being used to divert people from doing Neighbourhood Plans. To write in this document that you are encouraging people to do Neighbourhood Plans is misleading.	The Councils are supportive of the Neighbourhood Plan process but as identified within the SCI, these must be community led. These plans must conform to adopted Local Plans but it is not the intention that they 'divert' people from doing their own Neighbourhood planning and shaping places/communities.	No changes to SCI required.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
Part 2 Planning Applications				
2.1 The pre-application stage				
21969	Comment	The Joint SCI should include a list of statutory and other main consultees for planning applications (including NHS Property Services Ltd). The contact details and consultation thresholds for NHSPS are outlined in the attached document.	It is not considered necessary to provide a full list of statutory and/or other main consultees, (to include NHS Property Services or otherwise), or to reference consultation thresholds for residential led development within this section, (although NHS Property Services are identified as a consultee for Local Plan consultations - Part 1 of the SCI). The focus of part 2 of the SCI is how our wider communities can become more involved in the planning application process rather than our own consultation processes and procedures once we are in receipt of an application.	No Change to SCI required.
21987	Comment	Page 19 point 2.1 - 3rd paragraph - there seems to be little engagement with local councils by developers at pre application stage	Our commitment to encouraging pre-application discussion between the developer and 'local councils', in addition to other interested parties/stakeholders, is emphasised within the SCI. Further and as specified on p.19, under the provisions of the Localism Act, developers are now required to undertake consultation on certain larger developments and the consultation duty has been extended to some types of 'ordinary' planning applications.	No change to SCI required.
21860	Comment	I would like to submit National Grid's response to West Suffolk's consultation on the Draft Statement of Community Involvement. We welcome the consultation and the draft document. It provides clear, appropriate and constructive guidance on how consultation should be carried out in West Suffolk. Part 2 - Planning Applications sets out a particularly strong approach and includes methods of consultation which National Grid endorses.	Comment(s) noted	No change to SCI required
21917	Comment	A website alone is an insufficient way of engaging with the public and must be combined with other methods.	Not all of the methods of engagement listed require access to a computer. Developer forums and public exhibitions do allow other means of engagement and the opportunity to raise questions/queries with the developer/Council officers.	No change to SCI required

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
21940	Comment	Any adverse effect on villages to the west of the A1307 corridor especially Linton, Bartlow and Hildersham should be mitigated by s106 monies.	The consultation response does not relate to the provisions of the SCI.	No change to SCI required.
<i>2.2 Publicising our planning applications</i>				
21930	Comment	Suggest in this section you add: "we will endeavour to place such notice within 7 working days of the planning application having been registered. If we are unable to do so then we will send such notice, via email or post, for the applicant to post outside the premises. The 21 day notification period will start from when the notice is posted outside the premises regardless of which method is used." This is to overcome the problems associated with delays to the planning process as was recently caused by the 5 week IT outage when the planning software license failed.	The proposed amendment is not deemed necessary. The site notice allows 21 days from the date it is posted for interested parties to make comments.	No change to SCI required
21988	Comment	1) page 20 point 2.2 - what about reconsultation with local councils when developers make changes to plans previously submitted? 2) Page 23 TPO Applications - paragraphs 2 and 4 - which is the preferred "route" FHDC or St Edmundsbury?	1) If a revision to an application is significant this may trigger another period of consultation which will include the Parish Council. It is considered that this is appropriate and that for more minor amendments, there is not a need to re-consult. The Parish Council can always make contact with the relevant Case Officer in order to discuss the progress of a specific application. 2) There is not a 'preferred' route as such but there is a commitment to a 'common' approach to the administering/'advertsing' of TPO applications. Details will be made available in due course.	No change to SCI required.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
21983	Comment	<p>1) Members felt strongly that they should be informed of the details of all application in the Parish and any major applications in an adjoining parish that are near to the parish boundary and thus could have an affect on the inhabitants of the parish.</p> <p>2) Members also feel that when revised information is received from the applicant that they should be informed where the revision is significant. They appreciate that this will not necessarily trigger a new consultation period.</p> <p>3) On page 23 parish councils are included in the minimum for TPOs.</p>	<p>1) Parish Councils are informed of the details of all applications within their administrative boundary. The Parish Councils can also be included on the distribution list for the 'weekly list' of planning applications on request and can follow-up queries relating to specific applications of interest with the relevant case officer. The weekly list will include the details of applications submitted, ('major' or otherwise), within adjoining Parishes.</p> <p>2) As identified, if a revision to an application is significant this may trigger another period of consultation which will include the Parish Council. It is considered that this is appropriate and that for more minor amendments, there is not a need to re-consult. The Parish Council can always make contact with the relevant Case Officer in order to discuss the progress of a specific application.</p> <p>3) As identified on p.23, Parish Council's are notified and will continue to be notified of TPO applications submitted within their administrative areas.</p>	<p>1) No change to SCI required, 2) No change to SCI required, 3) No change to SCI required.</p>
<i>2.3 How we will engage with our communities</i>				
21912	Comment	<p>Requests for a screening opinion under the EIA regulations should be placed on the Council's website when they are received. The Council should also notify the relevant parish or town councils of a screening request.</p>	<p>Appropriate information in support of the applications that are received is made available on the websites of both Councils. It is not considered appropriate to identify the nature of the supporting documents that will be available to view on the Council websites within the context of the SCI.</p>	<p>No change to SCI required.</p>
21926	Comment	<p>The Council should also notify relevant town and parish councils of any planning applications as well as statutory consultees and other relevant organisations which are not statutory consultees but which would have an interest in the application such as the Suffolk Preservation Society, The Dedham Vale AONB and Stour Valley Project and the Clare Society. They should also notify any know opposition groups.</p>	<p>The Council have statutory and other consultees that they consult with regard to their applications. The focus of the SCI is how we will engage our wider communities in the planning application process rather than our 'internal' procedures and processes for processing the application. It is not considered necessary to make reference to the statutory/'other' consultees within the SCI.</p>	<p>No change to SCI required.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
21982	Comment	<p>1) Few new initiative to help promote dialogue between interested parties, and in particular Parish Councils. No confidence that there will be any greater co-operation with parish councils and local electorated.</p> <p>2) Draft does not seem to reflect the government's localism agenda and clear commitment to enhance the role of local people, or the aims of the NPPF to reinforce a locally-led planning system.</p>	<p>1) There is a clear commitment to engaging with Parish/Town Councils, (1.4, p.15), and our methods for engaging with our communities are outlined within Table 1. A number of these initiatives should promote dialogue with a range of interested parties and stakeholders. Further, there is a commitment to promoting pre-application discussions between developers and the local communities affected by proposals, (including the Parish Councils), see section 2.1, p.19. It is considered that our methods for engaging with our communities and promoting dialogue among stakeholders are appropriate.</p>	No change to SCI required.
21932	Comment	<p>Against "Viewing of planning applications", and similar to what is mentioned re Newmarket, then the opportunity to view Haverhill based applications should include the Haverhill Town Council premises in the Arts Centre.</p> <p>Please contact the Town Clerk (Will Austin) in this regard.</p>	<p>It is considered that the locations for viewing local plan documentaion are appropriate and accessible. The councils would be willing to make further hardcopies available on request for display at alternative venues.</p>	No change to SCI required.
21952	Comment	<p>The item I would most like to be adapted is:- "For St Edmundsbury, planning applications are available for inspection at West Suffolk House on Western Way in Bury St Edmunds between 9.00 am and 5.00pm Monday to Friday and at Haverhill House, Lower Downs Slade in Haverhill between 9.00 am and 5.00pm Monday to Friday."</p> <p>I would dearly love to see in full size, the plans etc, with my own eyes. However, being in full time work, these hours are totally unsuitable.</p> <p>Please advise if these hours could be extended until perhaps 6pm or maybe Saturday mornings added for viewing or to speak to a planning officer.</p>	<p>It is unfortunate that the times are unsuitable but the applications are made available during normal opening hours for the venues in question. The documentation is also made available on the Council websites and hardcopies of documentation can be made available on request. It is considered that the arrangements for the display of planning applications are appropriate.</p>	No change to SCI required.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
21962	Comment	<p>1) TPO These need to have a notice displayed at the site as local knowledge and concerns can then be contributed. Trees subject to TPO could be tagged/marked permanently so that unlawful operations can be more easily spotted.</p> <p>2) Neighbour notifications systems should be reviewed as this has failed seriously in the past. Also checks made that owner notices have indeed been displayed as required.</p> <p>3) Parish councils should also display locations of current planning applications on the most used/prominent noticeboard, not just know themselves.</p>	<p>1) As identified on p.23, a consistent approach will be adopted across the Authority areas and the respondent's views will be taken into account in developing this process. At this time all TPO applications in FHDC are advertised via site notices. It is not considered appropriate to 'tag' or 'mark' the trees.</p> <p>2) Comments with regard to neighbour notification issues are noted.</p> <p>3) Parish Councils are free to advertise TPO applications as they see fit.</p>	No change to SCI required.