

Responses received to submission Statement of Community Involvement (10 April 2007–21 May 2007)

Name of respondent	Organisation	Paragraph No	Comment	Council's Response	Council's Suggested Changes
1 .Amanda Steward	Disability Rights Commission	None	No resources to respond to such consultations	Noted	
2. Rachel Lim	Tetlow King Planning (on behalf of West Midlands RSL Planning Consortium)	Introduction Paragraph 3.6	Supports inclusion of introductory paragraph setting the scene within Warwick District. Supports Council's intention of Council to involve 'hard to reach' groups. Supports SCI and would wish to be involved at all stages of LDF production establishing meaningful dialogue as a RSL and main providers of affordable housing	None	
3. Amanda Smith		None	No comments at this stage	None	
4. Mr G Symes	Kenilworth Town Council	Various	Sound. No further changes suggested	None	
5. Mr Nadeem Sikander	Environment Agency	Appendix 2	Include EA on consultation database if this has not already been done. Appendix 2 should be amended to describe the development where the EA should be consulted in line with Circular 04/2006 [The Town & Country Planning (Flooding) (England)	This had already been done and the EA has been consulted at all stages. This change has already been acknowledged and is reflected in the note at the end of the Appendix. The Council would have no objection to including	

Name of respondent	Organisation	Paragraph No	Comment	Council's Response	Council's Suggested Changes
			Direction 2007]	all details in the table if this was thought beneficial.	
6. Mr Harry Goode	Shirley Estates Developments Ltd	All	Sound. Wish to support the Council in its approach to the SCI and in producing a sound and technically competent document.	None	
7. Philip Page	Individual	Parking and traffic and development (not SCI paragraphs)	Sound. Other comments are not relevant to the SCI but relate to experiences of the respondent in dealing with the council over the last 12 months on a variety of matters	None	
8. Mrs Joanna Illingworth	Kenilworth Society	All	Sound. Comments relate to the principle of having to prepare such documents and the new planning system, namely that <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the drawing up of the SCI is cumbersome, long and expensive. That there are no tangible benefits to the council tax payer. Added value is nil. The system has placed an unwelcome burden on voluntary bodies, trawling through documentation which is time consuming and unrewarding. LPA's have had the system 	None	

Name of respondent	Organisation	Paragraph No	Comment	Council's Response	Council's Suggested Changes
			<p>imposed upon them and are not responsible for it.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hope that these views are passed onto the made available to the appropriate government minister. 		
9. Mrs Chris Hemming	British Waterways	All	Sound.	None	
10. Clive Phillips	Warwickshire Constabulary	None	Email requesting all future consultation information go to senior officers in each police station locally	These officers have been added to the Consultation Database	
11. Rose Freeman	Theatres Trust	All	<p>Sound.</p> <p>Extends thanks for including Theatres Trust as statutory consultee and adding paragraph giving details of joining the database</p>	None	
12. Justin Milward	Woodland Trust	Section 4.5	<p>Unsound under test 9</p> <p>The Woodland Trust should be consulted on all planning applications that affect ancient woodland</p> <p>The Woodland Trust would like to be listed in 'Other Consultees' in Appendix One</p>	<p>The council agreed to do this after the draft SCI consultation period and the Trust has been added to the database.</p> <p>It is not thought necessary to specifically name the trust in the document as the list of consultees is not meant to be exhaustive, but it could be added if it is considered expedient</p>	

Name of respondent	Organisation	Paragraph No	Comment	Council's Response	Council's Suggested Changes
13. Mr Michael Jeffs	Campaign to Protect Rural England	Appendix 1	<p>Sound</p> <p>Perplexed that the CPRE is not named as a consultee in Appendix One whereas charities such as Age Concern are specifically named.</p> <p>Hope to fall within 'General Consultation Bodies' but would welcome being specifically named.</p>	CPRE appear in Appendix One under 'Other Consultees' '(s) Environmental Groups at national, regional and local level, including: i. CPRE.' Mr Jeffs was informed of this and responded by email that he was sorry that he had not seen the entry	
14. Ruth Bradford	Warwickshire County Council	<p>Section 3 – Table 6</p> <p>Section 4 – Paragraph 4.4</p>	<p>Sound.</p> <p>A key for this table could be added</p> <p>States that more information on 'Hard to Reach' groups is given in section 6 paragraph 6.7. This should be paragraph 6.9</p>	<p>The council agree that a key should be added for clarity</p> <p>The council agree that this typographical error should be corrected</p>	<p>Add the following key to Table 6:-</p> <p>* This means of consultation/ publicity may be used at this stage</p> <p>✓ This means of consultation/ publicity will be used at this stage</p> <p>(1) See paragraph 9.7</p> <p>(2) Statutory requirement</p> <p>Amend Section 4, paragraph 4.4, second sentence, to read '<i>More information on this is given in section 6 paragraph 6.9.</i>'</p>
15. John Turner	Warwick Society	Sections 2,3,4,5 Paragraphs 2.1, 3.1, 4.1,	<p>Unsound under test 7</p> <p>It is not clear what a DPD is. In paragraph 5.1 it is attached to Site</p>	The definition of a DPD is given in the glossary of terms.	Amend bullet point 6 in the list on paragraph 5.1 to read ' <i>Site</i>

Name of respondent	Organisation	Paragraph No	Comment	Council's Response	Council's Suggested Changes
		5.1, 5.2, 5.4	<p>Specific Allocations but in the diagram at 5.2 it shows that the Core Strategy, Site Specific Allocations, Adopted Proposals Map, Area Action Plans and other Development Plans are all DPDs</p> <p>The glossary says that a DPD is a planning policy document; are DPDs successors of the Local Plan and if so this needs to be explained.</p> <p>The key on the diagram at paragraph 5.2 indicates 'required, optional and project plan'. Does optional mean that it is optional to consult or an optional document</p> <p>Section 5 should be clearer and placed at the beginning of the document, incorporated into Section One or relocated as Section Two. By doing so the line A) Local Development Framework which</p>	<p>To avoid confusion, the council suggests that the words 'development plan documents and' are removed from paragraph 5.1 bullet point 6.</p> <p>The preface on Page 3 of the SCI explains that the LDF is a portfolio of documents which replaces the Local Plan. Further detail is not considered to be appropriate to the SCI and is covered in other documents which should be read in conjunction with each other in the same way as a Local Plan</p> <p>The diagram has been taken from PPS12, however the council would have no objection to the word 'document' being added after the word optional to avoid confusion.</p> <p>The LDF is explained in both the Preface and the Glossary of Terms. Reference to the LDF is first made in the Preface and again at paragraph 1.1, where it is</p>	<p><i>Specific Allocations'</i></p> <p>Add the word '<i>document</i>' after '<i>optional</i>' in the key to the diagram in paragraph 5.2</p>

Name of respondent	Organisation	Paragraph No	Comment	Council's Response	Council's Suggested Changes
			<p>appears for the first time without explanation, at paragraph 2.1, 3.1 and 4.1 will be properly connected with the text and the status of a DPD fully understood</p> <p>It would be helpful if an updated list of LDS documents was included in the SCI indicating which are DPDs and which SPDs without having to consult the website</p>	<p>explained. It is therefore not considered necessary to explain it again in paragraph 2.1, 3.1 and 4.1.</p> <p>It is not considered necessary to move this section of the document since it forms part of the supporting information for the previous sections. The first section of the document was designed to be a quick reference section for those wishing to gain a swift overall view of the consultation process. After this section the more detailed background information is explained and this is where Section Five belongs logically.</p> <p>It is not considered appropriate to repeat detailed information from other LDF documents. The list would become out of date quite quickly as the LDS is amended annually and this would result in the SCI similarly requiring annual updating.</p>	
16. Jane Ware	Government Office for the		Sound		

Name of respondent	Organisation	Paragraph No	Comment	Council's Response	Council's Suggested Changes
	West Midlands	Paragraph 9.3	Should be clarified. The text should be amended to refer to the fact that the WCC is responsible for Minerals Waste and Planning Applications and that the WCC SCI provides a framework for Community Involvement in Minerals and Waste Planning Applications	Whilst the paragraph does state that the WCC is responsible for Waste and Minerals issues, it does not specifically mention related planning applications or that the SCI also relates to the consultation regarding such applications, therefore the council would agree that this paragraph could be more clearly written	Amend paragraph 9.3, first sentence to read ' <i>As we are a two tier authority in this area, Warwickshire County Council has responsibility for waste and mineral planning and related planning applications.</i> ' Add the following sentence to the end of paragraph 9.3 ' <i>The SCI provides the framework for community involvement in waste and mineral planning applications</i> '
		Table 2	For consistency, it would be useful to include a footnote about the email alert system as in Table 3	The council agrees that this could be done for consistency	Add footnote to Table 3 - " <i>Those subscribing to the Planning Policy email alert system will receive notification in advance of the commencement of these stages (to subscribe to this service access the page on our website http://www.warwickdc.gov.uk/WD/C/Environment+and+planning/Planning/Email+alert+-+Planning+Documents.htm)</i> "
		Table 6	A key needs adding for *, (1) and (2)	The council agrees that this should be done as in representation 14 above	Add key as at representation 14 above
		Appendix 1	Numbering of other consultees needs amending – both (ii) and (jj) are listed twice	The council agrees that this needs to be corrected	Re-number consultees from (jj) onward in Appendix 1

Name of respondent	Organisation	Paragraph No	Comment	Council's Response	Council's Suggested Changes
		Appendix 4	Referred to in list of appendices but not attached	The council agrees that Appendix 4 should no longer appear in the index of appendices and should be removed	Remove reference to Appendix 4 in the index on Page 7
17. Bob Sharples	Sport England	All	Sound	None	
18. Michael Holliss	On behalf of Gallagher Estates	N/A	Sound	None	
19. Bigwood	On behalf of Mr & Mrs Orr	Table 6 Table 7 Section 5.1	Unsound No reference to figure in brackets (1) and (2). Provide appropriate text It would be normal to include all parish councils and registered associations in the consultation process. Amend text to include these references There is no reference in the dot bullet points to 'designated conservation areas' and listed buildings. Amend text accordingly	The council agrees that this should be done as in representation 14 above This table describes the methods of consultation rather than those who will be consulted. It would not therefore be appropriate to include this information here Conservation Areas and Listed Buildings are covered under separate legislation. Additional guidance relating to these subjects would be included in the Supplementary Planning Documents which are included on the list	Add key as at representation 14 above
20.	On behalf of		Unsound		

Name of respondent	Organisation	Paragraph No	Comment	Council's Response	Council's Suggested Changes
Bigwood	John Burman & Sons	Table 6	No reference to figure in brackets (1) and (2). Provide appropriate text	The council agrees that this should be done as in representation 14 above	Add key as at representation 14 above
		Table 7	It would be normal to include all parish councils and registered associations in the consultation process. Amend text to include these references	This table describes the methods of consultation rather than those who will be consulted. It would not therefore be appropriate to include this information here	
		Section 5.1	There is no reference in the dot bullet points to 'designated conservation areas' and listed buildings. Amend text accordingly	Conservation Areas and Listed Buildings are covered under separate legislation. Additional guidance relating to these subjects would be included in the Supplementary Planning Documents which are included on the list	
21. Rod Wheat	Individual	All	<p>Too much jargon and business-speak. This may result in the lack of response to consultations especially from 'hard to reach' groups. Extends sympathy and cannot see a way forward.</p> <p>How would anyone be notified of airport development since it is not</p>	<p>Incorrect form submitted for this stage of the process. Mr Wheat advised but declined to submit correct form. The jargon and business-speak has been reduced to the minimum achievable whilst retaining the wording of the legislation for compliance</p> <p>Mr Wheat has been advised that this type of development</p>	

Name of respondent	Organisation	Paragraph No	Comment	Council's Response	Council's Suggested Changes
			classed as 'Major Development' apparently in the Town & Country (General Development Procedure) (Amendment) (England) Order 2006	is likely to be included under item (d) or (e) and would therefore be classed as a 'Major Development' with the corresponding level of consultation illustrated in the table in Appendix 2	
22. Peacock & Smith	On behalf of Wm Morrison Supermarkets		No particular comment to make but would like to be involved in future stages of document production	Not duly made , as received after the end of the consultation period, however there are no issues to deal with	