

APPENDIX 1

INSPECTOR'S REPORT DERWENTSIDE DISTRICT COUNCIL STATEMENT OF COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

Inspector: David Robins BA PhD FRTRI

Date: 22nd November 2006

Derwentside District Council Statement of Community Involvement (July 2006)

INSPECTOR'S REPORT

Introduction

- 1.1 An independent examination of the Derwentside District Council's Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) has been carried out in accordance with Section 20 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. Following paragraph 3.10 of Planning Policy Statement 12: Local Development Frameworks, the examination has been based on the 9 tests set out (see Appendix A). The starting point for the assessment is that the SCI is sound. Accordingly changes are made in this binding report only where there is clear need in the light of tests in PPS12.
- 1.2 A total of 23 representations were received, all of which have been considered. The Council proposed a number of amendments to the SCI in response to representations received, and these have been taken into account in the preparation of this report. Further information was requested from the Council in relation to Test iv and this information is contained in Appendix B to this Report.

Test 1

- 2.1 The Council has undertaken the consultation required under Regulations 25, 26 and 28 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004.
- 2.2 This test is met.

Test 2

- 3.1 Paragraphs 1.6 – 1.15 recognise the links between the LDF, the SCI and the Community Strategy. The SCI explains in Paragraphs 1.10-1.11 the structure of the Derwentside Strategic Partnership, the sub-groups which make up the Partnership and how these existing groups will be utilised in the consultation on Development Plan Documents (DPDs). Paragraph 2.29 states that are obvious benefits in synchronising community involvement initiatives between the Community Strategy and the Local Development Framework (LDF) in order to reduce costs and to avoid the duplication of consultation exercises.
- 3.2 I am satisfied that the Council recognise the links between the strategies, the Local Development Documents (LDDs) and the associated consultation exercises.
- 3.3 This test is met.

Test 3

- 4.1 The Council has set out in Appendix 1 of the SCI those groups which will be consulted. This list includes the statutory bodies from PPS12 Annex E. It is stated in this appendix that the Council holds a database of consultee details and that this will be updated as necessary. The SCI at Paragraphs 2.24 – 2.28 makes it clear that the Council will consult with additional local stakeholders where appropriate.
- 4.2 As a result of representations received on the submission document the Council have agreed to add certain bodies to the consultee list in Appendix 1 and agree that these bodies should be added to this list.
- (R1)** Add the following to Appendix 1 under the relevant section of 'Other Consultees'
- "The Theatres Trust
Royal Mail Group Plc"
- Also amend 'House Builders Federation' to "Home Builders Federation".
- 4.3 The re-organisation of certain consultation bodies, such as the recent re-organisation and re-naming of English Nature should be acknowledged in the SCI as other such re-organisations will doubtless occur and I recommend an additional sentence be added to this effect.
- (R2)** Insert the following to Appendix 1 before the list of consultees:
- "Please note, this list is not exhaustive and also relates to successor bodies where re-organisations occur."
- 4.4 Subject to the recommendations above, this test is met.

Test 4

- 5.1 Paragraphs 2.12 – 2.20 show that the Council will involve and inform people from the early stages of DPD preparation and Paragraphs 2.30 – 2.47 and Appendix 3 set out the range of methods the Council will employ to do this. The Council clarify in Appendix 3 the stages at which consultation will take place and who will be consulted at those stages. It shows that consultation will take place with the key stakeholders during the issues and options stage of DPD production in accordance with Regulation 25.
- 5.2 However, Appendix 3 omitted the consultation requirements for alternate sites which may occur if a DPD is concerned with allocations of land (Regulations 32 and 33). The Council were, therefore, asked to provide an amended Appendix 3 to take this stage of the process into account. This amended table is given in

Appendix B to this report and I agree that it should replace the submission Appendix 3.

(R3) Replace the submission version of Appendix 3 with that given in Appendix B to this report.

5.3 With regard to the DPD process diagram (Figure 1 of the SCI) the Council should add the following underneath the diagram.

(R4) Add directly beneath Figure 1:

“Please note that Figure 1 does not depict the alternate site stage of the process. Information on this stage is to be found in Appendix 3 and Paragraph 2.15.”

5.4 The process for Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs) is given in Figure 2 and Paragraph 2.20.

5.5 As a result of these amendments I am satisfied that providing these stages are followed the consultation proposed will be undertaken in a timely and accessible manner.

5.6 Subject to the recommendations above, this test is met.

Test 5

6.1 Paragraphs 2.30 – 2.47 of the SCI set out the methods that the Council propose to use to involve the community and stakeholders. These cover a range of recognised consultation techniques that will present information via a range of different media. The Council acknowledge the benefits and disadvantages of the different methods and indicate through Appendix 3 at what stages of LDD preparation the various methods might be employed.

6.2 The SCI acknowledges at Paragraphs 2.26 – 2.27 that the Council may have to provide extra support to facilitate consultation with certain groups or individuals, and proposes (at Paragraph 2.28) how they might do this. Paragraphs 2.21 and 2.28 explain how the Council will make their information accessible to all members of society, and sets out how they will meet requirements of the Race Relations Act 2000 and the Disability Discrimination Act 1995.

6.3 I am satisfied that the methods of consultation proposed in the SCI are suitable for the intended audiences and for the different stages in LDD preparation.

6.4 This test is met.

Test 6

- 7.1 Paragraph 1.20 of the SCI explains how the Council will seek to ensure that sufficient resources are put in place to achieve the scale of consultation envisaged. I am satisfied that the Council is alert to the resource implications of the SCI.
- 7.2 This test is met.

Test 7

- 8.1 Paragraph 2.19 explains how the results of community involvement will be taken into account by the Council and used to inform decisions. The Council also propose to prepare reports at the end of the consultation period explaining how views have been considered and documents changed in light of the community involvement. The SCI states at Paragraph 2.21 where these will be made publicly available.
- 8.2 As a result of a representation received on the submission document the Council have proposed an addition to Paragraph 1.16 to clarify their commitment to 'feedback' on the results of community involvement consultations and I agree that the following amendment to the SCI be made.
- (R5)** Insert to the last bullet point of Paragraph 1.16 the following:
- "Meaningful feedback that gives an explanation of how and why decisions were taken and why opposing arguments were rejected."
- 8.3 Subject to the recommendation above, this test is met.

Test 8

- 9.1 Paragraphs 1.23 – 1.27 of the SCI provides information on monitoring and review and confirms the Council's intent to review the SCI on an annual basis. This section makes reference to the role of the Annual Monitoring Report and sets out the main factors that will be considered when reviewing the SCI.
- 9.2 I am satisfied that the Council have mechanisms for reviewing the SCI and have identified potential triggers for the review of the SCI.
- 9.3 This test is met.

Test 9

- 10.1 The SCI at Section 3 describes the Council's policy for consultation on planning applications. This section meets the minimum

requirements and provides additional methods of consultation. This distinguishes between procedures appropriate to different types and scale of application, and includes information on how the consultation results will inform decisions while Appendix 4 gives details of the Council's neighbourhood Notification Policy.

- 10.2 The SCI does not adequately deal with the question of how the results of consultation will be reported and how the results will be used to inform the decision making process, and I recommend a change to rectify this.

(R6) Insert the following to the end of Paragraph 3.11:

"The results of any such consultation will be reported and taken into account in decisions made by, and on behalf of, the Council."

- 10.3 Subject to the recommendation above, this test is met.

Conclusions

- 11.1 The Council have set out in Appendix 5 of their Regulation 31 Statement a number of proposed changes to the SCI in response to representations received on the submission document. This is given as Appendix C to this report. These suggested amendments do not affect the substance of the SCI but they do improve the clarity and transparency of the submission SCI. Some have been included in the body of the report and I agree that the remainder also be included.

(R7) Implement the changes proposed in Appendix C to this report.

- 11.2 Paragraph 2.5 of the SCI provides details of the Local Development Framework. As the content of the framework may change over time the Council should add the following directly below the diagram in Paragraph 2.5:

(R8) "As the content of the Local Development Framework may change over time please visit our website www.derwentside.gov.uk for the latest version."

- 11.3 The Council wish to correct an omission to the submission SCI by the insertion of a paragraph relating to Tree Preservation Orders and I agree that the following should be inserted into the SCI:

(R9) Insert the following text as a new paragraph immediately before Paragraph 3.3. Subsequent paragraphs should be re-numbered accordingly.

"When designating a new Tree Preservation Order (TPO) we will inform the landowner(s) and consult neighbours on the same basis as if it were a planning application."

11.4 The Council have provided a schedule of editorial changes to the submission document to remove text that would become redundant once the document is adopted. This schedule is given in Appendix B to this report.

(R10) Implement the editorial changes given in Appendix B to this report.

11.5 In the event of any doubt, please note that I am content for such matters, plus any minor spelling, grammatical or factual matters to be amended by the Council, so long as this does not affect the substance of the SCI.

11.6 Subject to the implementation of the recommendations set out in this Report, the Derwentside District Council SCI (July 2006) is sound.

INSPECTOR

David Robins

David Robins BA PhD FRTRI

APPENDIX A
TESTS OF SOUNDNESS

Examination of the soundness of the statement of community involvement

3.10 The purpose of the examination is to consider the soundness of the statement of community involvement. The presumption will be that the statement of community involvement is sound unless it is shown to be otherwise as a result of evidence considered at the examination. A hearing will only be necessary where one or more of those making representations wish to be heard (see Annex D). In assessing whether the statement of community involvement is sound, the inspector will determine whether the:

- i. local planning authority has complied with the minimum requirements for consultation as set out in Regulations;¹
- ii. local planning authority's strategy for community involvement links with other community involvement initiatives e.g. the community strategy;
- iii. statement identifies in general terms which local community groups and other bodies will be consulted;
- iv. statement identifies how the community and other bodies can be involved in a timely and accessible manner;
- v. methods of consultation to be employed are suitable for the intended audience and for the different stages in the preparation of local development documents;
- vi. resources are available to manage community involvement effectively;
- vii. statement shows how the results of community involvement will be fed into the preparation of development plan documents and supplementary planning documents;
- viii. authority has mechanisms for reviewing the statement of community involvement; and
- ix. statement clearly describes the planning authority's policy for consultation on planning applications.

From: Planning Policy Statement 12: Local Development Frameworks

¹ The Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations, 2004.

APPENDIX B
DERWENTSIDE DISTRICT COUNCIL
CORRESPONDENCE



The Planning Inspectorate

Room 3/25 Hawk Wing
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Temple Quay
Bristol BS1 6PN

Direct Line 0117-372 8468
Switchboard 0117-372 8000
Fax No 0117-372
GTN 1371-8468
Email: Stephen.carnaby@pins.gsi.gov.uk
<http://www.planning-inspectorate.gov.uk>

Mike Allum
Derwentside District Council
Civic Centre
Consett
DH8 5JA

Your Ref:

Our Ref: PINS/V1315/429/2

Date: 12th October 2006

DERWENTSIDE DISTRICT COUNCIL - STATEMENT OF COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

Dear Mr.Allum,

As the appointed Inspector for your Authority's Statement of Community Involvement I am requesting comments from the Council on the following points in order to assist in assessing the soundness of Derwentside District Council's Statement of Community Involvement.

Test iv

Though the Council have correctly identified the requirements for alternate site consultations (Paragraph 2.15) if a DPD is concerned with allocations of land, the SCI should also show how consultation at this stage will be carried out. Therefore, could the Council provide an amended Appendix 3, to give details of this stage under the Major Allocations & Stanley AAP sections of this table?

Editorial Changes.

There are some areas of the SCI (for example Paragraphs 1.2 – 1.3) which contain text that will become redundant once the document is adopted. Could the Council provide a table that summarises these necessary changes?

These answers are to assist in the production of a binding report. Once you have submitted your response to these questions, the report will be produced as quickly as possible. Please reply to Steve Carnaby whose details are given above. Thank you for your assistance in this matter.

Yours sincerely,

Keith Holland

Keith Holland BA(Hons) Dip TP MRTPI ARICS

Schedule of Changes to Derwentside Statement of Community Involvement Submission Draft

Paragraph Number	Change
1.2	Delete
1.3	Delete
1.17	<p>Replace 'The SCI will be tailored to meet the specific needs and characteristics of the District. It will engage with representatives of all groups and individuals that are interested in planning for their area. The Council will promote equality and diversity, and not discriminate against anyone who wishes to participate in the planning system.'</p> <p>With 'The SCI is tailored to meet the specific needs and characteristics of the District. It is designed to engage with representatives of all groups and individuals that are interested in planning for their area. The Council promotes equality and diversity and does not discriminate against anyone who wishes to participate in the planning system.'</p>
1.19	<p>Replace 'The SCI will set out the various methods that the Council will use to enable people to contribute to the planning process, in regard to both Development Control (the processing of planning applications) and the new LDF.'</p> <p>With 'The SCI sets out the various methods that the Council will use to enable people to contribute to the planning process, in regard to both Development Control (the processing of planning applications) and the new LDF.'</p>
1.23	<p>Replace 'Once the SCI is adopted it will not be a static document.'</p> <p>With 'The SCI is not a static document.'</p>

In addition to the changes above is it possible to insert a new paragraph preceding para. 3.33 relating to new Tree Preservation Orders (text below) as this was omitted from the original Submission Draft.

'When designating a new Tree Preservation Order (TPO) we will inform the landowner(s) and consult neighbours on the same basis as if it were a planning application.'

APPENDIX 3: CONSULTATION METHOD MATRIX FOR THE LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK

Consultation Options	Development Plan Documents														Supplementary Planning Documents	
	Core Strategy			Major Allocations				Development Control Policies				Stanley AAP				
	Pre Consult	Preferred Options	Submission	Pre Consult	Preferred Options	Submission	Alternate Sites	Pre Consult	Preferred Options	Submission	Alternate Sites	Pre Consult	Preferred Options	Submission	Pre Consult	Draft
Newspaper Supplements	1,2	1,2	1,2	1,2	1,2	1,2		1,2	1,2	1,2		1,2	1,2	1,2	1,2	1,2
Inside Derwentside	1,2	1,2	1,2	1,2	1,2	1,2		1,2	1,2	1,2		1,2	1,2	1,2	1,2	1,2
Questionnaires	1-6			1-6				1-6				1-6			1-6	
Planning for Real				1,2,3								1,2,3				
Public Exhibitions	1,2	1,2,3	1,2,3	1,2,3	1,2,3	1,2,3		1,2,3	1,2,3	1,2,3		1,2,3	1,2,3	1,2,3		
Table Scheme Display				1,2,3								1,2,3				
Focus Groups	1-6			1-6				1-6				1-6			1-6	
Written Notification	1-6	1-6	1-6	1-6	1-6	1-6	1-6	1-6	1-6	1-6	1-6	1-6	1-6	1-6	1-6	1-6
Web-based Consultations	1-6	1-6	1-6	1-6	1-6	1-6	1-6	1-6	1-6	1-6	1-6	1-6	1-6	1-6		1-6

Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	Group 4	Group 5	Group 6
Hard to reach groups, for example young people, ethnic minorities	Groups and individuals with little or no planning background/training, for example residents associations, businesses	Groups and individuals with some planning background, for example Parish Councils, Primary Care Trusts	Groups and individuals with planning background, for example planning consultants and developers	Interest and Pressure Groups, for example, Sport England, CABE, Age Concern etc	Durham County Council, NE Assembly, neighbouring authorities and other statutory consultees

APPENDIX C
DERWENTSIDE DISTRICT COUNCIL
PROPOSED CHANGES

Appendix 5 - Derwentside Submission Draft Statement of Community Involvement – Derwentside District Council Responses

Reference	00038	
Name	Mobile Operations Association (MONO)	
Who they represent	All mobile phone operators	
Summary of response	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Generally support the content of the Submission Draft SCI • Note inclusion of the Mobile Operators Association in the list of Reg 26 consultees within Appendix 4a. • Also note intention to consult on future Local Development Documents 	

Reference	00042	
Name	Jenny Loring, Conservation Officer	
Who they represent	English Nature	
Summary of response	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Welcome the response and changes made in regard to their representation made at the Draft SCI stage. • Look forward to further consultation. 	

Reference	00063	
Name	Alan Hunter	
Who they represent	English Heritage	
Summary of response	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delighted by the Council's response to comments made at the Draft SCI Stage. 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Circular 09/2005 – regarding lack information provided to English Nature in respect to planning applications. Not targeted at Derwentside District Council • When proposing Conservation Area boundaries or changes in boundaries, etc, it maybe necessary to involve the community in question meetings and workshops. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will add ‘hold a workshop with local residents to explain the implications of the designation.’ As a new bullet point at the end of paragraph 3.43.
--	--	---

Reference	00070	
Name	Gerry Carpenter	
Who they represent	Government Office for the North East	
Summary of response	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No comment to make at this juncture. 	

Reference	00079	
Name	Rachael Oxley	
Who they represent	Countryside Agency	
Summary of response	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SCI should include reference to the services of Planning Aid. • Lists the CA’s ‘Planning tomorrow’s countryside’ statement, PPS1 and their new revised planning policy statement: ‘Planning Principles for Landscape, Access and Recreation’ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning Aid is referred to in paragraphs 2.48 to 2.51. On further reflection it may be clearer to include these paragraphs at the end of Section 1 to emphasise that Planning Aid can provide assistance with both the LDF and Development Control.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Absence of comment is an expression of their priorities, but if our LDF has examples of good practice of Planning Principles for Landscape, Access and Recreation, then please contact the CA. 	
--	--	--

Reference	00093	
Name	Equal Opportunities Commission	
Who they represent		
Summary of response	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Request not to see further documents relating to the Local Plan/LDF 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will be deleted from the Council's consultation database.

Reference	00094	
Name	John Hedley	
Who they represent	Police Architectural Liaison Officers	
Summary of response	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reference to Police Architectural Liaison Service should be contained in the SCI. If the Police felt it appropriate, is there any merit in including contact details for requesting Crime Prevention Surveys / inclusion on crimering / contacts to establish neighbourhood watch schemes? Also do likewise with fire safety matters? 	

Reference	00104	
Name	Ian Radley	
Who they represent	Highways Agency	
Summary of response	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No further comment other to say that their role is covered by Appendix 1 of the SCI. 	

Reference	00106	
Name	Jason Mckewon	
Who they represent	Durham County Council	
Summary of response	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Writing to express the County Council's general support towards the Submission SCI. Apologies as the number provided by us regarding the Local Government Ombudsman, Ann Seex, was incorrect (should be "01904 380 200" rather than "01904 380 300", correct number confirmed at www.lgo.org.uk/contact.htm). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Telephone number will be amended as suggested.

Reference	00109	
Name	Wendy Hetherington	
Who they represent	One North East	
Summary of response	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> OneNorthEast has no further comments to make regarding the SCI for submission. Further documents from the LDS will be welcome. 	

Reference	00124	
Name	Sport England	
Who they represent		
Summary of response	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In addition to the previous comments, Sport England welcomes and supports Para 3.20. It implies that notification of the decision or withdrawal will only be when negative representations have been made. • Sport England are required to record decisions and reasons and report them to the Department of Culture, Media and Sport. This monitoring is not only in the case of where objections have been made but also where no objections or comments have been submitted. Sport England would therefore request that para 3.20 be amended to ensure that Sport England is notified of every decision and the reasons on each application it has been consulted upon. 	

Reference	00141	
Name	The House Builders Federation	
Who they represent		
Summary of response	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Target Groups - Welcome the inclusion of developers/agents/landowners in the list of target groups for consultation. • Consultation Methods - The significant number of methods set out is noted. HBF would like to emphasise the importance of traditional consultation techniques, like letters and email notification, are a 	

	<p>vitaly important aspect of the overall consultation and participation process.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pre-Application advice - Welcome inclusion of section regarding Pre-Application advice. Setting out Derwentside's approach to pre-application advice can only strengthen this objective. • Section 4 - HBF supports para 4.1. Example of community involvement method in para 4.6 is noted, but HBF feel that applicants should have flexibility to decide upon methods of consultation which best reflects the scale and nature of the proposal rather than prescribing methods of consultation. • Appendix 1 - Welcomes inclusion, but The House Builders Federation is now trading as Home Builders Federation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will add 'Obviously this method is only given as an example and it will be for the applicant to determine the methods best suited to the scale and nature of their proposal.' To the end of paragraph 4.6. • Will be changed as suggested.
--	--	---

Reference	10005	
Name	Wear Valley District Council	
Who they represent		
Summary of response	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wear Valley District Council has no objections to the Derwentside Submission Draft SCI. 	

Reference	10008	
Name	Northumberland County Council	
Who they represent		
Summary of response	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The document is clearly presented, concise and comprehensive in the techniques to be used for 	

	community involvement. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The use of selected tables and diagrams provides a clear and straightforward illustration of the components of the LDF, the groups you intend to consult and the methods by which you will consult each group. 	
--	--	--

Reference	10012	
Name	Northumbria Area Environment Agency	
Who they represent		
Summary of response	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No further comment to add to those made in February (Draft SCI) 	

Reference	10357	
Name	Brian Stephenson	
Who they represent	Hedleyhope Parish Council	
Summary of response	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overall support for the SCI. 	

Reference	10649	
Name	Denis Lavin	
Who they represent	Councillor, Derwentside District Council (Annfield Plain)	
Summary of response	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Para 1.6 - Earlier Draft SCI para 1.4 was simple in its clarity, the new para is long winded and may lend itself to misinterpretation and result in opaque decisions. 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Para 1.20 - This is much clearer now, thank you. It some of the misterious planning process to another directorate and thus may encourage more member participation. • Para 2.18 - SPDs. Introduces something which could completely change the Development Plan Process. Whilst the Secretary of State can be come involved later, any changes that result could cause problems, even reversal of an original published decision. • Para 3.6 - Information on Electronic Database (Planning Apps). Current system does not always display location maps or application details. System requires overhaul or upgrade? • Para 3.16 - Commences "Anyone can speak..." Legal position of Councillors not part of DC Committee is difficult. Knowledge of Councillors can be deemed prejudicial. The opening statement may in the light of the current legal position need to be addressed. • Para 4.4 - Bullet Point 2. Regret, but cannot agree with the bland Government figure of 50 dwellings. This is probably a reasonable figure within a large Conurbation, but in Derwentside the addition of 20-30 dwellings in our 'country' environment appears to me to be much more relevant. • Appendix 2 - Tests of Soundness. I appreciate that most people including myself can have a problem with the written word of an organisation as most use a certain amount of jargon, however in the Submission 	
--	---	--

	Draft there is a complete absence of such. I do however have a problem with the compatibility of tests 1-9 at appendix 2 page VI with those on the Response Forms final page. At best they don't line through.	
--	--	--

Reference	10696	
Name	Mhora Samuel, Director	
Who they represent	Theatres Trust	
Summary of response	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They are a statutory consultee for planning applications that affect land on which there is a theatre. • Also it was established by the Theatres Trust Act 1976 'to promote the better protection of these theatres', and we are disappointed not to be included within Appendix 1. • Pleased that Appendix 1 explains that the consultation database will be 'fluid' and updated regularly. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will be added to Appendix 1.

Reference	10742	
Name	Heather Evans, Tours Co-Ordinator	
Who they represent	Cyclists Touring Club	
Summary of response	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We have no comments, but look forward to being contacted on other LDF documents. 	

Reference	10753	
Name	Christine A Lever	
Who they represent		
Summary of response	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 1 Paragraph 1 Test 4 – Seek the views of the community whenever appropriate, welcome them and take them fully into account. Cannot be obtained without a fundamental change of attitude by Council, Officers & members. • Section 1 Paragraph 16 Test 5 – Response forms should be flexible allowing the community to express its views. Tests of Soundness not fit for purpose, do not address how procedures are operated. Response form restrictive and not accessible. • Section 1 Paragraph 20 Test 6 – Documents/information made available as promised. Documents made available only when asked in writing. • Section 1 Paragraph 23 Test 8 – AMR available in paper format, all interested groups and individuals informed of minor changes to the SCI. Paper copy easier to read, keep and refer to than from a website. People need to know about changes to the SCI. • Section 2 Paragraph 4 Test 4 – The Community's vision and aspirations not the councils. Council should not impose its own vision. • Section 2 Paragraph 3 Test 5 – There should be full and effective community participation in a review of a LDD. As LDDs are shorter, simpler and quicker to adopt than the Local Plan, they are well adapted to 	

	<p>community involvement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 2 Paragraph 4 Test 4 – Special attention needed to achieve good design, listening to experts and the community. CABE + The Steadings, Planning (Listed buildings...) Act 1990, PPS1, community all evidence for poor design. • Section 2 Paragraph 4 Test 6 – Staff resources put into satisfactory SPDs. Generic policies in the DC DPD mean SPDs all the more essential. • Section 2 Paragraph 4 Test 7 – Importance of SPDs & guidance to be recognised and appropriate expertise put into producing them. Generic policies in the DC DPD mean SPDs all the more essential. SPDs are an excellent way of involving the community to develop a vision for their locality. • Section 3 Paragraph 3 Test 4 – Para belongs in 'Involvement of the Community during the processing of a planning application'. PPS1, Para 12 explain what pre-application discussions should achieve. • Section 3 Paragraph 3 Test 6 – Negotiations are worthwhile and cost-effective if they speedily achieve a satisfactory outcome: a well-designed scheme. Currently, negotiations are time consuming and carried out between applicant and case officer. • Section 3 Paragraph 3 Test 4 – Preliminary advice should draw attention to policies, DPDs, guidance, SPDs, etc, and improve the overall quality of applications. • Section 3 Paragraph 5-39 Test 1 – Quotes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will amend first bullet point in para 2.4 from 'the Council's Vision for its area' to 'a vision for the area'.
--	---	--

	<p>PPS1, Para 40 – planning tem should create a partnership with the community. Not sufficient for the planning team to merely comply with minimum requirements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 3 Paragraph 5-39 Test 4 – Commitment of the Planning Team is vital for the community to be involved in a timely and accessible manner. Procedures in para 3.5-3.39 are fit for purpose, but what matters is how they are operated. • Section 3 Paragraph 5-39 Test 9 – A change of attitudes amongst Council, officers and members is needed. Consultation has not delivered as Officer's think their views are correct and members rely on them. • Section 3 Paragraph 5 Test 4 – Emphasis needs to be altered, a Council, Officers & Members must actively promote & support community involvement. In many cases, public have not been given reasonable opportunity to comment in the past. • Section 3 Paragraph 5 Test 4 – Design: consultation with relevant organisations and involvement of a qualified architect + consultees unfamiliar with the district should be informed of SPGs/SPDs. Only Stat. Consultees are mentioned here, non-stat. consultees? • Section 3 Paragraph 5 Test 6 – Better management of resources to enable effective community participation. Currently, resources are routinely used to favour the applicant and put across 	
--	---	--

	<p>the planning team's opinion.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 3 Paragraph 5 Test 6 – Design & conservation officer should welcome community involvement and pay attention to their views. Currently, the Design & Conservation Officer refused to entertain representation from the community “in order to maintain her independence”. • Section 3 Paragraph 6/7 Test 4 – Weekly list should be available earlier than the Wednesday of the following week & sent to partnerships & residents associations. The time for people to inspect applications and deliver their comments is very short, impeding community involvement. • Section 3 Paragraph 8-10 Test 4 – Case officer's discretion to extend neighbour notification should be exercised widely & notices placed in the Advertiser 1st rather than Northern Echo. It is essential to draw the attention of the whole community to planning applications in a timely & accessible manner. • Section 3 Paragraph 11 Test 9 – Objections made by the community should carry weight in helping the reach a decision. Members of the local community, particularly parish councils, partnerships and residents groups have local knowledge and expertise to express the views of the community. • Section 3 Paragraph 11 Test 4 – Representations made by the community should be passed onto the applicant. As community representatives are not advised to contact applicants 	
--	---	--

	<p>direct the onus is upon case officers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 3 Paragraph 12 Test 4 – Support • Section 3 Paragraph 13/14 Test 4 – Re-consultation on amendments/alterations. People who are interested in the application, community and objectors, deserve a reasonable opportunity to comment upon a definitive proposal. • Section 3 Paragraph 15 & 19 Test 4 – Provide objectors and 3rd Parties with the date and time of their DC Committee meeting at least 5 working days in advance OR Have the agenda available 10 days before the meeting. 2 or 3 days is insufficient as proposed compared to the treatment afforded to the applicant OR if the agenda is available 10 days before, reports can be purchased 5 days beforehand. • Section 3 Paragraph 15 Test 4 – Committee reports should report back the community's responses, setting out SPG/SPD guidance & discussing consultation responses. The Community's point of view is not fully & fairly propounded to the DC Committee & thus considered by them. Current reports are biased in the case officers favoured outcome of the application. • Section 3 Paragraph 16 Test 4 – DC Committee & Members should be well prepared, seek good co-operation and good timing (smooth running of committee). Committee does not run smoothly as officers have unlimited time to speak & community not allowed such freedom. • Section 3 Paragraph 20 Test Unknown – 	
--	--	--

	<p>Support.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 3 Paragraph 27-32 Test 6 – More resources needed into Enforcement so that monitoring can be carried out, at least in the most sensitive areas. Currently only reliant upon breaches being reported by the public is not acceptable. • Section 3 Paragraph 34/35 Test 4 – Preferable for site notices for all tree & advertisement applications. Not just neighbours affected by these works, but the whole community as well. • Section 3 Paragraph 36 Test 4 – Care needed over materials, design and siting of agricultural buildings. Existing buildings often are very large and obtrusive into the countryside. • Section 4 Paragraph 1 Test 4 – Support, simple and cost effective ways of involving the community. • Section 4 Paragraph 4/5 Test 9 – 1000 sqm or 50 dwellings per hectare are far too large; people with extensions should be encouraged to talk to neighbours. Smaller than 500 sqm or fewer than 25 dwellings would still affect a large village. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will add ‘and non-statutory consultees.’ after ‘statutory consultees.’ in para 3.5.
--	---	---

Reference	10754	
Name	Brian K Masterman	
Who they represent	Lanchester Partnership Ltd	
Summary of response	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 1 Paragraph 16 Test 7 – Explanation of what is meant by “Feedback”. A need to explain how and why a decision was reached and opposing arguments rejected. • Section 2 Paragraph (Omission of 2.35 from previous draft) Test 5 – Omission of Public Meetings from methods of consultation. We consider Public Meetings an invaluable means of communicating with the general public and facilitating dialogue between planners and planned. • Section 2 Paragraph (Omission of 2.39 from previous draft) Test 5 – Omission of Briefing Workshops from the range of methods of consultation. We consider them to be useful means of two-way dialogue between planners, groups and the public. • Section 3 Paragraph ¾ Test 5 – Pre-application advice should also serve to inform applicants of the policies and advice relevant to the proposals. Applicants should have some idea as to whether their proposals will succeed or not. • Section 3 Paragraph 13 Test 4 – Dealing with planning applications raising multiple issues, it would be preferable to refuse the permission rather than negotiate modifications over a long period of time. 	Will replace the last bullet point with ‘Meaningful feedback that gives an explanation of how and why decisions were taken and why opposing arguments were rejected.’

	<p>Prolonged negotiations invariably put objectors at a disadvantage.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 3 Paragraph 27 Test 9(?) – Planning enforcement should include effective monitoring of developments. If the public is to have confidence in the DC system it needs to be administered equitably. • Section 3 Paragraph 43 Test 7 – Only indicates how consultation will be initiated but not how to respond or how they will be taken into account. Provision needs to be made for giving and receiving comments and providing feedback on reasons why options were chosen/rejected. • Section 3 Paragraph 44 Test 7 – Only indicates how consultation will be initiated but not how to respond or how they will be taken into account. Provision needs to be made for giving and receiving comments and providing feedback on reasons why options were chosen/rejected. 	
--	--	--

Reference	10762
Name	Kathryn Gibson
Who they represent	The Garden History Society
Summary of response	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No comment at this time.

Reference	10795	
Name	Michael Jones	
Who they represent	Sanderson Weatherall (Royal Mail Group Plc)	
Summary of response	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please include Royal Mail Group Plc on list of consultation bodies in Appendix 1, as Royal Mail Group is the umbrella organisation of Post Office Property Holdings. • Section 4 – refers to pre-application discussions and can be improved by incorporating information from consultation exercises into applications. And advice on how the applicant should present their amendments back to the Council for comments. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will add Royal Mail Group plc to Appendix 1.