

Statement of Community Involvement: Submission Feb 2006

Berkshire Unitary Authorities' Joint Strategic Planning Unit		Rep ID	518	Agent ID	0
Comment ID	627	Type of Comment	GC		
Comment	At present the chairmanship and vice-chairmanship of the Joint Committee is unresolved for the new municipal year. Therefore, these are officer comments on behalf of the Joint Strategic Planning Committee.				
Response	Noted.				
Recommendation	No change to SCI required.				
We have no comments to make on the Runnymede SCI Regulation 28.					
<hr/>					
CATA Community Alternative Transport Association		Rep ID	488	Agent ID	0
Comment ID	620	Type of Comment	OB		
Comment	Paragraph 3.13, Table 3: Table 3 - Please add "and will continue to do" to the phrase "what we also do" for greater clarity.				
Response	Add the words: "Our procedures include:" above the bullet points under the heading "What we also now do", to give greater clarity.				
Recommendation	Add the words: "Our procedures include:" above the bullet points under the heading "What we also now do", to give greater clarity.				

Comment ID 621 Type of Comment OB

Comment

Insufficient effort given to ameliorate disadvantages of different methods.

Public meetings:
Should provide transport for anyone with genuine need. Give information explaining access - public transport times and stops, cycle and walking routes (with guides at relevant times) and give contacts for lifts.

If held to encourage difficult to reach groups e.g. Day Centres and Youth Clubs, etc, pressure groups should be invited to speak on aspects relevant to audience.

Website:

Libraries etc could offer courses to explain access to the specific website, explain sections and how to fill in, use 'have your say'. Could have 2 people per computer and have someone available to answer individual problems when encountered. If choice of courses at centres in each community with provision for access as above - public meetings would be superfluous. At present experienced, community driven members of society who retired before widespread introduction of web are severely disadvantaged.

Response

Public meetings are always held in central locations that are easily accessible by a choice and range of travel modes.

Concerns regarding access to the LDF website are noted, and changes can be made to make it easier to use. However unfortunately, resource constraints would prevent officer assistance being provided at public libraries.

Recommendation

Amend the layout of the LDF website to make it easier to access and use.

Comment ID 635 Type of Comment OB

Comment

Additional bullet points (para 3.137) or additional paragraphs (3.14/157) needed to ensure all points of public interest and finance involved are included.

"Planning applications should apply to all changes to land in Borough ownership and to all changes involving access and rights of way including footpaths, cycle routes and bridle ways whether or not established by long term use."

"Notification of all planning applications involving access and rights of way should be given in writing to all walking, cycling, riding community and environmental transport groups as appropriate."

Response

Planning applications are not required for all changes of use, if related development within the same use class is proposed. Works to rights of way including footpaths, cycle routes and bridle ways are the responsibility of Surrey County Council, but a planning application would be required for any development proposal affecting a right of way, footpath, cycle route or bridle way.

Surrey County Council's Highways Department and Rights of Way Officer would be consulted in connection with any such proposal, but consideration should be given to including walking, cycling, the riding community and environmental transport groups wherever appropriate.

Recommendation

Consider notifying relevant walking, cycling, riding community and environmental transport groups of planning applications affecting rights of way, bridle ways, and walking and cycling routes, wherever appropriate, and adding relevant text to section 3 of the SCI.

Chertsey Society

Rep ID 422 Agent ID 0

Comment ID 628 Type of Comment GC

Comment

Table 1:
The final column is headed C/T which presumably stands for 'cumulative total', however we do not feel that this provides information which aids to the clarity of the document, and we therefore suggest that this column should be omitted.

Response

Comments noted and agreed.

Recommendation

Amend Table 1 to delete the final column labelled C/T (cumulative total).

Chertsey Society

Rep ID 422 Agent ID 0

Comment ID 629 Type of Comment GC

Comment

Appendix 2:
This is a comprehensive list of organizations that have been (and will continue to be) consulted. We recognize that on page 27 only a list of headings has been provided; we would like reassurance that a) Rotary Clubs b) Friends of Chertsey Museum and c) Runnymede Association of Arts will be included on the list.

Response

The Rotary Clubs of Egham and Chertsey, and Runnymede Arts Association, are included within the list of stakeholders provided in Appendix 2 of the Statement of Compliance for the SCI, which accompanied the Submission document in February 2006. However, while Chertsey Museum is included, the Friends of Chertsey Museum are not, and can be added to the LDF consultee list for future stages.

Recommendation

Add Friends of Chertsey Museum to the LDF consultee list for future consultation stages.

Co-operative Group
Rep ID 529 **Agent ID** 459

Comment ID 695 **Type of Comment** GC

Comment

Co-operative Group has a number of interests within the borough, and as such are keen to be involved in the formulation of the new policy framework for the area, particularly in relation to issues which directly affect their interests.

Co-operative Group would be grateful to continue to be consulted on all stages of the Local Development Framework preparation.

Response

Comment noted.

Recommendation

No change required to SCI.

Elmbridge Borough Council

Rep ID 489 **Agent ID** 0

Comment ID 626 **Type of Comment** GC

Comment

Elmbridge Borough Council has no comments to make on this document.

Response

Noted.

Recommendation

No change to SCI required.

Comment ID 630 Type of Comment SU

Comment

The Statement of Community Involvement is supported with regard to Para 5.4 where it acknowledges that the Council can only request, not require developers to carry out the extra consultation.

Response

Support noted.

Recommendation

No change to SCI recommended.

Fairoaks Airport Limited

Comment ID 632 Type of Comment GC

Comment

Although we are actually in the Borough of Surrey Heath, we are in regular correspondence with your Planning Department over developments within our Aerodrome Traffic Zone which encompasses part of your Borough and write to place on record that we would wish to be involved in the preparation and review of the LDF in the future under the SCI.

In that respect, the December 2003 Government White Paper on Aviation clearly states that Fairoaks currently provides facilities for Business Aviation (including flying training) and should be allowed developments to improve these facilities in future. Therefore it is a reasonable assumption that some reference should be made to our Airport established in the 1930's in your Local Development Framework documents.

As well as providing facilities for local employment which must go with proposed additional housing, Fairoaks meets a need for local businesses seeking direct efficient links by air around the UK and into Europe, provides for leisure and recreational flying and an educational forum by visits from local schools.

Response

Fairoaks Airport Limited is a registered LDF consultee, and is given the opportunity to comment upon relevant Development Plan Documents (DPD) at each stage of their preparation. Full reference to the Airport is provided within the Development Control DPD (paragraph 11.5, Preferred Options, September 2005), which acknowledges that its future role is recognised as being of importance to the Borough.

Recommendation

Fairoaks Airport Limited to remain as a registered LDF consultee. No change to SCI document recommended.

GOSE

Rep ID 227 *Agent ID* 0

Comment ID 618 **Type of Comment** GC

Comment

You appear to be ensuring that the consultation is inclusive and is employing a variety of methods to reach many of those affected. However, you may wish to consider whether the documents can be made available in other languages and in Braille. Will the documents also be available in large print and audio versions? You may also wish to give some additional thought on which specific groups will be able to access the Local Development documents, and how and where this will be done.

On behalf of the First Secretary of State, I can advise that we have no further comments to make on the document.

Response

The documents can be provided in different languages and formats upon request. Meetings are held regularly with local groups and organisations regarding the Local Development Framework, and information is circulated as appropriate.

Recommendation

No change to SCI recommended.

Highways Agency

Rep ID 245 *Agent ID* 0

Comment ID 619 **Type of Comment** GC

Comment

Thank you for your letter of 24 February 2006 inviting the Highways Agency to comment on the Submission Draft Statement of Community Involvement Consultation document.

We have no additional comments to our letter of 3 October 2005.

Response

Comments noted.

Recommendation

No change to SCI recommended.

Comment ID 634 Type of Comment OB

Comment

It is not clear from the Statement of Community Involvement what pre-application consultation methods are likely to be required of developers for major applications. Table 5 (p17) sets out the consultation stages and methods, but does not provide any indication as to the scale and methods to be used by developers at the pre-application stage in order to satisfy the Local Planning Authority. If pre-application consultation is not carried out properly by the developer then the Council is entitled to refuse planning permission or to require further consultation. Therefore to avoid this situation occurring the Local Planning Authority should provide more detailed information as to the methods to be employed and extent of public consultation required of developers at the pre-application stage.

An objection is therefore made to the SCI on the grounds of soundness test 9, as the SCI fails to clearly identify the pre-application consultation, which is to be undertaken by developers for major planning applications. This objection is raised in relation to the omission of this information from the SCI and Table 5 (p17).

Response

The Council does not have any specific guidance on the nature and scale of pre-application consultation for major proposals, which will vary according to each proposal. It is always recommended that the Local Planning Authority be contacted to discuss the appropriate level and methods of consultation before the application is progressed.

Recommendation

Add reference within the supporting text advising that the Local Planning Authority be contacted to discuss the appropriate methods and level of pre-application consultation before major proposals are progressed.

Mobile Operators Association

Comment ID 633 Type of Comment SU

Comment

We welcome the Council's inclusion of the Mobile Operators Association as a 'Specific' consultee within the Appendices to their Statement of Community Involvement, and we look forward to receiving further consultations on future Local Development Documents as they emerge.

Response

Support noted.

Recommendation

No change to SCI recommended.

Royal Borough of Windsor & Maidenhead

Rep ID 496 Agent ID 0

Comment ID 587 Type of Comment GC

Comment

The Royal Borough has been correctly identified as a specific consultation body within Appendix 2 of the document.

Response

Noted

Recommendation

No change to SCI required.

Royal Borough of Windsor & Maidenhead

Rep ID 496 Agent ID 0

Comment ID 588 Type of Comment GC

Comment

Those Parish Councils within the Royal Borough's administrative boundary, and being adjacent to Runnymede Borough Council, have not been identified within the list of specific consultation bodies within Appendix 2 of the document. Parish Councils are a 'relevant authority' under the Town & Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004. I understand that steps have been taken to rectify this error as it relates to the statutory consultation and I suggest that Appendix 2 is updated to reflect the status of Wraybury Parish Council, Old Windsor Parish Council and Sunningdale Parish Council as relevant authorities.

Response

Agreed that Appendix 2 should be coercted to include Wraybury Parish Council, Old Windsor Parish Council and Sunningdale Parish Council as relevant authorities for consultation purposes.

Recommendation

Correct Appendix 2 of the SCI accordingly.

Runnymede Association of Arts

Rep ID 248 Agent ID 0

Comment ID 622 Type of Comment OB

Comment

Ensure that RAA is included in list of non statutory bodies to be consulted.

Response

The Runnymede Arts Association is automatically consulted as a non statutory body, and is included within the list of stakeholders provided in Appendix 2 of the Statement of Compliance for the SCI, which accompanied the Submission document in February 2006. The consultee list within the SCI only provides a summary of consultee groups, rather than listing all organisations.

Recommendation

No change to SCI recommended.

SEEDA

Rep ID 167 Agent ID 0

Comment ID 623 Type of Comment SU

Comment

Support expressed for the SCI.

Response

Support welcomed and noted.

Recommendation

No change to SCI recommended.

Sport England

Comment ID 631 **Type of Comment** OB

Comment

Paragraph 5.2:

The sections related to consultation on planning applications do not refer to how the Council will provide feedback to Statutory Consultees. Consultees should be advised of the decisions made by the Council in writing. Sport England is required to provide returns to the Department of Culture Media and Sport reporting on the impact of its representations on planning applications where it is a statutory consultee. In many cases Sport England has helped advise and negotiate for and on behalf of the Council on playing field matters but is not then informed of the outcome. This should be done as a matter of courtesy. At the end of each year Sport England has to enquire about the outcome of applications which is time consuming for both Sport England and the local authority. Sport England is aware of other Councils who have stated how they will report decisions in their SCI. This should be standard practice.

Rep ID 487 **Agent ID** 0

Response

Paragraph 5.2:

Runnymede Borough Council's procedure is that formal consultees and those who have commented on applications are registered on the planning admin system, and so automatically receive an acknowledgement and a letter providing them with details of the decision. However, if a Planning Officer liaises directly with an organization, seeking advice about a particular application, they may not necessarily be added to the admin system, and therefore may not receive notification of the final decision. All decisions are available to view on the Council's website at www.runnymede.gov.uk, by following the 'Planning link', and searching within the 'Planning Decision Register On-line' facility.

Details of the above procedures can be added to the SCI to provide clarity.

Recommendation

Details of the procedures outlined in the response can be added to the SCI to provide clarity.

Comment ID 616 Type of Comment GC

Comment

We have no further comments to add to our previous representations made and reiterate its content, particularly the importance of early consultation on relevant applications.

The type of application which Thames Water would want to be consulted upon can be found in Appendix 5 of our "Guide for LPAs on Planning Application & Development Plan Consultation with Thames Water Utilities as Statutory Water and Sewerage Undertaker" which Thames Water published and circulated in Summer 2004 to all LPAs in our area. This includes, although not exhaustively:

1. Large scale residential, commercial and industrial proposals
2. Conversions including multiple flats
3. Construction of car parks
4. Development on contaminated land

This guide will be of assistance to you when determining which planning applications to consult Thames Water on and when finalising your DPDs.

Recommendation

No change to SCI required.

Response

Comments noted.

The Theatres Trust

Comment ID 617 Type of Comment GC

Comment

The Theatres Trust is an advisory Non-Departmental Public body and a statutory consultee on planning applications that affect land on which there is a theatre and was established by the Theatres Trust Act 1976 'to promote the better protection of theatres'. Our main objective is to safeguard theatre use, or the potential for such use, but we also provide expert advice on design, conservation, property and planning matters to theatre operators, local authorities and official bodies.

Thank you for your excellent Appendices of consultation bodies. We have no further comment to make on the SCI.

Recommendation

No change to SCI recommended.

Response

Comments welcomed and noted.

West Adlestone Residents Association

Rep ID 528 **Agent ID** 0

Comment ID 649 **Type of Comment** SU

Comment

The Council's strategy for community involvement links with other community involvement initiatives.

Response

Noted.

Recommendation

No change to SCI required.

West Adlestone Residents Association

Rep ID 528 **Agent ID** 0

Comment ID 650 **Type of Comment** SU

Comment

The SCI identifies in general terms which community groups and other bodies will be consulted.

Response

Noted.

Recommendation

No change to SCI required.

West Addlestone Residents Association **Rep ID** 528 **Agent ID** 0

Comment ID 651 **Type of Comment** SU

Comment

The SCI identifies how the community can be involved in a timely and accessible manner.

Response

Noted.

Recommendation

No change to SCI required.

West Addlestone Residents Association **Rep ID** 528 **Agent ID** 0

Comment ID 652 **Type of Comment** SU

Comment

The methods of consultation to be employed are suitable for the intended audience and for the different stages in the preparation of the local development documents.

Response

Noted.

Recommendation

No change to SCI required.

West Addlestone Residents Association

Rep ID 528 **Agent ID** 0

Comment ID 653 **Type of Comment** SU

Comment

The resources are available to manage community involvement effectively.

Response

Noted.

Recommendation

No change to SCI required.

West Addlestone Residents Association

Rep ID 528 **Agent ID** 0

Comment ID 654 **Type of Comment** SU

Comment

The statement makes clear how the results of community involvement will be fed into the preparation of development plan documents and supplementary planning documents.

Response

Noted.

Recommendation

No change to SCI required.

West Adlestone Residents Association

Rep ID 528 **Agent ID** 0

Comment ID 655 **Type of Comment** SU

Comment

It appears clear what will trigger a review of the SCI.

Response

Noted.

Recommendation

No change to SCI required.

West Adlestone Residents Association

Rep ID 528 **Agent ID** 0

Comment ID 656 **Type of Comment** SU

Comment

The SCI clearly describes the Council's policy for consultation on planning applications.

Response

Noted.

Recommendation

No change to SCI required.

West Adlestone Residents Association

Rep ID 528 **Agent ID** 0

Comment ID 657 **Type of Comment** SU

Comment

The Council has complied with the minimum requirements for consultation.

Response

Noted.

Recommendation

No change to SCI required.
