



Sedgefield Borough Council

Local Development Framework:
Submitted Draft Statement of Community
Involvement

Statement of Pre-Submission Consultation

September 2005

Statement of Pre-Submission Consultation for Sedgefield Borough Council **Statement of Community Involvement (SCI)**

1. Introduction

- 1.0.1 This statement has been prepared in accordance with Regulation 28¹. Its purpose is to set out how Sedgefield Borough Council involved the community in the preparation of the SCI. This statement sets out: who we initially consulted on our SCI (under Regulation 25); how they were consulted; a summary of the main issues that were raised during our consultations (during both the Regulation 25 information gathering, and first draft Regulation 26) and how these have been addressed in the submission draft SCI.
- 1.0.2 Preparatory work on the initial Draft SCI for Sedgefield commenced during 2004 at a time when new Government guidance on community involvement was continually being released. The document was prepared through a process bringing together officers within the Forward Planning and Development Control Teams, to utilise experience of previous consultation and community participation exercises, as well as establishing what is currently done by way of consultation and engagement.
- 1.0.3 Once adopted the SCI will form part of the Borough's Local Development Framework. Whilst it will not constitute a Development Plan Document, each Local Development Document prepared by the Borough Council will have to be accompanied by a statement of pre-submission consultation, showing compliance with the adopted SCI. Planning Services will also have to adhere to the standards and procedures it contains when determining planning applications, applications to prune or fell protected trees or on Enforcement issues.

2. Involving the Community in the SCI

- 2.0.1 In preparing the Draft SCI officers sought to rationalise the amount of consultation required by the Regulations. In this respect much of the consultation arrangements as required by Regulation 25 and 26 were combined.

2.1 Pre-submission Initial Consultation (Regulation 25)

- 2.1.1 An initial draft SCI was circulated to officers within Sedgefield Borough's Planning Services. This draft was also discussed at the 'County Development Plans Monitoring Group'. This group, which meets regularly throughout each year, consists of officers from the County Council and District Councils in County Durham. Planning departments at other

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

Councils (not within County Durham) that border the Borough of Sedgefield, were also in receipt of this draft for comments.

2.1.2 Much of the feedback to consultation and discussions undertaken through Regulation 25 was received on quite an informal basis. As a result of this initial informal involvement there were numerous changes made to the draft SCI.

2.2 Pre-Submission Public Participation on the Draft SCI (Regulation 26)

2.2.1 The Draft SCI was endorsed by Management Team, and by Borough Council Members at Cabinet during February and March 2005 and subsequently approved for public consultation. This consultation exercise took place between Monday 11th April and Monday 23rd May 2005.

2.2.2 More than 180 copies of the document were sent to statutory consultees, other local authorities (both within County Durham, and those which border Sedgefield), Town and Parish Councils (those within Sedgefield Borough, and those bordering Sedgefield from other administrative boundaries), Resident's Associations and Borough Councillors.

2.3 Letters

2.3.1 Various interest groups and other organisations whose contact details were held on our consultation database were sent letters notifying them that the SCI was out for a statutory six-week consultation period inviting their comments upon this draft. The letters also specified details where the document could be viewed and how comments relating to the document should be submitted to the Council. A detailed list of these consultees is attached at **Appendix 1**. At the time, the Borough Council believed these groups and organisations were inclusive of all the specific and general consultation bodies as specified by Regulation 25(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004 and those that are relevant to planning at a local level.

2.4 Availability at Council Offices and Buildings

2.4.1 During the statutory 6-week consultation period, copies of the draft Statement of Community Involvement and comments forms were available:

- o At the main Borough Council Offices (Green Lane);
- o In all libraries in the Borough.

2.5 Availability on the Council Website

2.5.1 The draft Statement along with the comment form for downloading were available on the Council's website (www.sedgefield.gov.uk). The subsequent Local Development Framework web pages provided more background information on the draft SCI and further advertised its consultation.

2.6 Publicity – Advertisement in the Local Press

2.6.1 The draft Statement of Community Involvement was advertised by way of a legal notice placed in the following newspaper circulating within the North East (**Appendix 3**):

Newspaper	Date Notice Published
The Northern Echo	11 th April 2005

2.6.2 A press release was also issued through the Borough Council's Communications Team and featured in local newspapers and Council publications to further advertise the consultation (**Appendix 4**).

2.7 Presentations

2.7.1 Concurrent to the statutory consultation, an invitation was extended to each of the Town/Parish Councils located within the Borough offering the opportunity for members of the Forward Planning Team to give a presentation on the SCI at the next Town/Parish meeting. The majority of these took up the offer and a number of presentations were given during the statutory period.

2.7.2 In April 2005 a presentation on the SCI was made to the Equality and Diversity Group. Attendees at the seminars included District Councillors and officers from different departmental Council service.

2.8 Pre-Submission Responses (Regulation 27)

2.8.1 As previously highlighted, the statutory six-week pre-submission draft consultation period ran from 11th April until the 23rd May 2005. This consultation (under Regulation 26) generated 121 comments from 36 respondents. A summary of these representations and main issues, in addition to how these issues have been addressed within this document is attached at **Appendix 2**.

2.9 Submission Stage Consultation (Regulation 28)

2.9.1 This consultation is to be undertaken when the SCI is formally submitted to the Secretary of State (SoS). The consultation will run from the 12th September until 24th October 2005 and consist of a letter (and copies of the submission document to all Statutory Consultees) sent to all of those bodies listed in the SCI (including those added as a result of the Regulation 26 consultation) inviting representations on the 'Submission SCI'. In addition to traditional paper representation forms available at deposit locations, email details have again been provided on the Council's website for those who wish to communicate electronically. The Submission Stage consultation will be publicised by a notice in the same newspaper used for the Regulation 26 consultation. A further press release will also be issued at this time. The Submission draft Statement of

Community Involvement will be available on the Council's website and at deposit locations. In addition, an article has been drafted for the latest edition of Inform Magazine (the Council's free magazine that is posted to the majority of households in the Borough).

- 2.9.2 Following this stage of consultation the SCI will be subjected to an independent public examination. During the independent public examination (anticipated December 2005) a Government appointed Inspector from the Planning Inspectorate will test the document for soundness as prescribed within "*Planning Policy Statement 12: Local Development Frameworks*". The Inspector will then prepare a report outlining the findings of the examination and make any recommendations for change if these are considered necessary. These recommendations will be binding and the Local Planning Authority will therefore be obliged to amend the SCI in line with the recommendations prior to formally adopting the document.

Appendices

Appendix 1 – Schedule of Consultees

Environment Agency	Ferryhill Town Council	Mr G. Hagger – Kier Land Ltd	Chilton Library
Highways Agency	Great Aycliffe Town Council	Mr Malcolm Walker – Peacock and Smith	Cornforth Library
Historic Buildings & Monuments Commission for UK	Sedgefield Town Council	Mr Justin Hancock – H.J. Banks Ltd	Ferryhill Library
English Nature	Shildon Town Council	Mr Christopher Padgett	Newton Aycliffe Library
The Strategic Rail Authority	Spennymoor Town Council	BAC Bulk Haulage Ltd	Sedgefield Library
Strategic Health Authority	Chilton Town Council	Mr Alistair Carr – Anvil Homes Ltd	Shildon Library
Home Office	Bishop Middleham Parish Council	Jay Everett – Storeys: SSP	Spennymoor Library
Department for Education & Skills	Cornforth Parish Council	Mr J T McCaskie	Trimdon Library
The Countryside Agency	Eldon Parish Council	Mr Jonathan M Burroughs – Bidwells	Etherley Parish Council
Department for Environment, Food & Rural Affairs	Fishburn Parish Council	Mr Ian Cyhanko – Barton Willmore Planning Partnership	Coatham Mundeville Parish Council
Department for Transport	Trimdon Parish Council	Mr D Martin – Acorn Residential Estates	Brafferton Parish Council
Department of Health	Windlestone Parish Council	Paul Medcalfe – Bellway Homes Ltd	Great Stainton Parish Council
Department of Trade & Industry	Middridge Parish Council	Paul Stock – North Country Homes Group Ltd	Heighington Parish Council
Ministry of Defence	Bradbury Parish Meeting	Miss Katie Lazzam – Malcolm Judd and Partners	Grindon Parish Council
Department of Work & Pensions	Mordon Parish Meeting	Mrs Sandra Thompson – Signet Planning	Stillington & Whitton Parish Council
The Department of Constitutional Affairs	Castles Residents Association	Claire Davy – Dickinson Dees	Elwick Parish Council
Department for Culture, Media & Sport	Chilton West Residents Association	Charles Robinson – CDS	Councillor David Newell
Office of Government Commerce	Lakes Residents Association	Katie Adderley – The British Wind Energy Association	Councillor Benjamin Ord
Age Concern	Williamfield Residents Association	Bryan Huntley – Halcrow Group Limited	Councillor Ms Marie Predski
Airport Operators	New Shildon Residents Association	Graham Bradley – Woodland Trust	Councillor Brian F. Avery
British Chemical Distributors & Traders Association	Ferryhill Station Residents Association	Robert Taylor – Plot of Gold Ltd	Councillor Mrs Agnes Armstrong
British Geological Survey	Linden Residents Association	John Robinson – Sedgefield Arts Recreation	Councillor Vincent Crosby
Chambers of Commerce	Dean Bank Residents Association	Mr M Smethurst	Councillor Brian Hall
Church Commissioners	Sunnydale Residents Association	Durham Wildlife Trust	Councillor Kevin Thompson

Civil Aviation Authority	Eden Residents Association	Forestry Commission	Councillor David Hancock
The Coal Authority	MARG	Dev Plan UK Ltd	Councillor David Brown
Commission for Architecture & the Built Environment	Dales Residents Association	Teesdale District Council	Councillor Barbara Clare
Commission for New Towns & English Partnerships	Burnhill Residents Association	Wear Valley District Council	Councillor Kathleen Conroy
Commission for Racial Equality	St Paul's Residents Association	Derwentside District Council	Councillor June Croft
Crown Estate Office	Lower Trimdon Residents Association	Durham City Council	Councillor Michael Dalton
Diocesan Board of Finance	R H Brown	Chester-le-Street District Council	Councillor Gareth Howe
Disability Rights Commission	Mrs J S Thompson – Merrington Grange Farm	Easington District Council	Councillor Ronald Patchett
Disabled Persons Transport Advisory Committee	Mr W Moorfoot	Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council	Councillor Christine Sproat
The National Grid Company	Alexander Sharp	Hartlepool Borough Council	Councillor James Wayman JP
Council for the Protection of Rural England	Louise Nicholson – Yuill Homes	Darlington Borough Council	Councillor Angela Fleming
Friends of the Earth	Mrs Powles	Tees Valley JSU	Councillor Martin Jones
Royal Society for the Protection of Birds	Ms Angela Turner	Councillor Andrew Smith	Councillor George Scott
The Wildlife Trusts	John Lavender – Plan Arch Design	Councillor W.M. Blenkinsopp	Councillor John Smith
Fire & Rescue Services	Rob Smith – Peacock and Smith	Councillor Malcolm Iveson	Councillor Enid Paylor
The Forestry Commission	John Potts Ltd	Councillor John Piggott	Councillor Keith Henderson
Freight Transport Association	John Calvert – Inventures	Councillor John Burton	Councillor John Robinson
Gypsy Council	David Rixson – Vincent and Gorbng	Councillor Andrew Gray	Councillor Mrs Joan Gray
Health and Safety Executive	M M Dawson	Councillor George Morgan	Councillor Terence Ward
Help the Aged	David Salkeld – Camtec Properties Ltd	Councillor Robert Stuart Fleming	Councillor William Waters
Housing Corporation	Tony Scorer – EDF Energy	Councillor Thomas Frank Forrest	Councillor J.G. Huntingdon
Learning & Skills Council	Dan Grierson – TNEI Services Ltd	Councillor Mrs Barbara Graham	Councillor Mrs Ina Jackson Smith
Local Agenda 21	Ted Jackson – Tilly Bailey & Irvine Solicitors	Councillor George Coulson Gray	Councillor Mrs Lorraine Smith
Civic Societies	Ian Lyle – England & Lyle	Councillor Alan Hodgson	Mr Phil Horan – TechniCAD Services
National Playing Fields Association	Mrs J Montgomery – Brimble, Lea & Partners	Councillor Mrs Lucy Hovvels	Alan Etherington

Network Rail	D J Halstead – The Planning Inspectorate	Councillor John Patrick Moran	Dr H J Stafford
Passenger Transport Authorities	Julie Hesmondhalgh – Blackett, Hart & Pratt Solicitors	Councillor Kester Noble	C. A Gray – Stonegrave Aggregates Ltd
Police Architectural Liaison Officers	Ranger Transport Services	Councillor Mrs Christine Potts	Andrew Hutton – Smiths Gore
Rail Freight Group	Chris Outtersides – GVA Grimley	Councillor Brian Meek	A. Mawston
Road Haulage Association	Mr A Moss – Ward Hadaway Solicitors	Councillor James Eric Higgin	Adrian Morgan Hopper
Sport England	Richard Hardy – Compassion in World Farming	Councillor John Khan	Karen Read – Robert Muckle Solicitors
The House Builders Federation	Laura Rheiter – RTPi	Commission for Racial Equality North of England	Malcolm Havercroft – Ordnance Survey
Traveller Law Reform Coalition	Peter Cumming – Carlton Land & Estates	Disability Alliance	Mrs V Horner – Heighington Parish Council
Women's National Commissions	Graeme Blenkinsopp – Wisemove Estate Agents	Business in the Community	Judi Scholey – Development Planning Partnership
One North East	Peter Nicol	CAVOS	Mrs E Sowerby
North East Assembly	Mr John Allison	CEN - Community Empowerment Network	Sgt Bob Porter – Ethnic Liaison Group
Regional Sports Board	R. A Beckwith Moore – Trimdon Estates Ltd	Sedgefield Primary Care Trust	Mr Sampson
Durham Constabulary (South Area)	Chris Harrison – Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners	Voluntary Organisations' Network North East	David Kerford – Section 55
Sedgefield NHS Primary Care Trust	Georgian Group	Durham Architectural & Archaeological Society	Dave Anderson – Hall Construction Services Ltd
Durham County Council	Victorian Society	Ancient Monuments Society	Mobile Operators Association
Durham County Council	Twentieth Century Society	Council for British Archaeology	English Nature
Sedgefield Borough Business Service	Garden History Society	Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings	Countryside Agency
Durham County Council	British Gas	Northumbrian Water	The National Trust
Government Office for the North East	Transco	English Heritage	

Appendix 2 – Comments Received and Officer Response

REFERENCE NUMBER	NAME	ORGANISATION	SECTION	PARAGRAPH	COMMENTS	FURTHER COMMENTS	SBC RESPONSE	SBC CHANGES
DSCI0001/01S	Valerie Adams	Darlington Borough Council	General	-	Document is generally comprehensive, clear and easy to read.		Comment noted.	No change
DSCI0001/02	Valerie Adams	Darlington Borough Council	4	4.3	It would be useful to define what "medium and large scale" means in terms of industrial & commercial development, and residential development		Agree.	Definitions provided in revised draft based on the North East Assembly's classification of major development.
DSCI0001/03	Valerie Adams	Darlington Borough Council	General	-	It would be useful if there is some commitment to consult adjacent parish councils where new policies are proposed that could affect land adjacent to these parishes.		Agree.	Neighbouring Town and Parish Councils will be consulted on proposals occurring within Sedgefield Borough but close to their administrative area.
DSCI0002/01S	Terry Holden	Sedgefield Borough Council	2	2.6(i)	Internal consultation with officers from other sections.		Noted.	Add to key group.
DSCI0003/01	Rodger Lowe	Sedgefield Borough Council	3	3.6.2	Should read "works to trees covered by a TPO and works to trees within a Conservation Area"		Noted.	Changes made to text as requested.
DSCI0003/02	Rodger Lowe	Sedgefield Borough Council	3.7	3.7.1	Should read "Under the Town and Country Planning (Trees) Regulations 1999 the LPA must determine notices regarding works... If the notice is not determined. ...required to keep a public register of notices. The notice details may be posted in a	public place close to the proposed work site...placing a provisional TPO on the tree(s). Insert additional text. Written replies are provided to all to representations, with an invitation to speak on the matter for up to 5 mins at DC Committee.	Noted.	Make changes to relevant paragraphs as requested.
DSCI0003/03	Rodger Lowe	Sedgefield Borough Council	3.7	3.7.2	New paragraph should read "Under the Hedgerow Regulations 1997 6 weeks notice must be given to the LPA if a landowner wishes to remove native hedgerows. The Parish Council must be consulted about the proposal and their representations taken into account.	The LPA may serve a Hedgerow Retention Notice if the hedgerow is judged to be 'important', as defined by the Regulations.	Noted.	Insert additional paragraph as requested.
DSCI0004/01	Dr H J Stafford		General	-	Seek deletion of Green Wedge designation around property		Comments not relevant to SCI. Will look at issue when bringing forward other LDDs.	No change

REFERENCE NUMBER	NAME	ORGANISATION	SECTION	PARAGRAPH	COMMENTS	FURTHER COMMENTS	SBC RESPONSE	SBC CHANGES
DSCI0005/01		Equal Opportunities Commission	General	-	Do not wish to be consulted again on any document produced for the LDF.		Noted.	Address has been deleted from consultation database.
DSCI0006/01S	Sam Kipling	Environment Agency	General	-	Documents addresses of the issues of importance in the Borough. The document is clear and easy to understand.		Comments noted.	No change
DSCI0006/02S	Sam Kipling	Environment Agency	General	-	There should be some mention of Strategic Environmental Assessment, as well as Sustainability Appraisal.		Agree	Amend text in paragraph 1.6.1 to address Strategic Environmental Assessment
DSCI0007/01S	Jill Stephenson	Network Rail	General	-	No comments to make at this stage but wish to be fully consulted on future documents		Comment noted.	No change
DSCI0008/01S	Vince Crosby	Sedgefield Borough Council	-	-			No specific comments made in their support of document.	No change
DSCI0009/01	Paul Balmont	Sedgefield Borough Business Service	2.3	2.3.2	It may be worth considering including a representative from the Sedgefield Business Forum or the LSP Economy Policy EP on the Advisory Panel in order to achieve private sector representation.		Agree.	The issue of an Advisory Panel will be discussed with the Cabinet. The outcome of this discussion will need to be agreed with the Council to take issue forward. Propose no change but keep situation under review.
DSCI0009/02	Paul Balmont	Sedgefield Borough Business Service	2.7	2.7.4	The Economic Development Section produce a quarterly 'Business in Focus' magazine which could be used to disseminate industrial/business developments and consultations.		Comments noted.	'Business in Focus' added as a possible consultation method to disseminate information.
DSCI0009/03	Paul Balmont	Sedgefield Borough Business Service	Appendix 2	Businesses	Appendix 2 - under the 'business' section, it may be worth considering Business in Focus magazine as a method of dissemination and Sedgefield Business Forum steering group and the Economy Group at the LSP as 'business community' consultees.		Agree.	Add these methods as a process to involve businesses in the Borough. WHERE?
DSCI0010/01	Graham Ramsden	British Waterways	-	-	Do not wish to be consulted again on any document produced for the LDF.		Noted.	Address has been deleted from consultation database.
DSCI0011/01	Raymond Cole	National Playing Fields	-	-	The NPFA would like to be involved in the preparation of Local Development Documents (i.e. the	NPFA will circulate a set of model policies which will provide the essence of the	Comments noted.	No change

REFERENCE NUMBER	NAME	ORGANISATION	SECTION	PARAGRAPH	COMMENTS	FURTHER COMMENTS	SBC RESPONSE	SBC CHANGES
					core strategy and generic development control policies).	NPFA's representation at the 'preferred options' stage. At the 'submission' stage the NPFA will check the document.		
DSCI0012/01	Julie Thorne	12 Eldon Close	-	-	Would like to reuse Police Station in N. Aycliffe for alternative uses (Theatre). Locate an Ice Rink/Roller Rink next to Leisure Centre.		Comments not relevant to SCI. Will look at issue when bringing forward other LDDs. Comments forwarded to Development Control for their formal response.	No change
DSCI0013/01S	Alan Hunter	English Heritage	General	-	English Heritage fully endorses the need for a full understanding of the constraints and assets, and their vulnerability to change, as a means of arriving at soundly based planning decisions.	The involvement of the local community is crucial to this process.	Agree.	No change
DSCI0013/02	Alan Hunter	English Heritage	3.0	3.0.1	The time permitted for a response from statutory consultees is set at 21 days from the date of notification. The English Heritage Charter, however, states that it should be 21 days from the date of receipt.		Regulations state that it is 21 days from the date of notification, but in addition to this, suggestion will present procedural difficulties at the LPA will not be able to definitively say when a letter was received without contacting each consultee.	No Change
DSCI0013/03	Alan Hunter	English Heritage	3.1	3.1.2	Press notices are also required for other types of application - departures from the development plan, proposals affecting the setting of a listed building or the character or appearance of a conservation area, affecting a public right of way	or where the application is accompanied by an Environmental Impact Assessment. Circular 15/92 applies.	Agree	Text in revised document amended to highlight that these other types of applications also require a press notice.
DSCI0013/04	Alan Hunter	English Heritage	3.2	3.2.3	Where changes to planning applications are 'significant', the authority should give serious consideration to insisting on a fresh application, rather than dealing with them as amendments.		Nothing stated in the Regulations to enable LPA to insist that this is the case, however it is the action that we would encourage the applicant to take as part of the negotiations.	No Change
DSCI0013/05	Alan Hunter	English Heritage	3.4	3.4.1	Rather than having to request a copy of the decision notice each time a response is made to a consultation, an assumption should be made that one is required and a		Not all Statutory Consultees do require a decision notice. Development Control Section therefore requests that Statutory Consultees	No Change.

REFERENCE NUMBER	NAME	ORGANISATION	SECTION	PARAGRAPH	COMMENTS	FURTHER COMMENTS	SBC RESPONSE	SBC CHANGES
					copy sent automatically.		who do, attach a closing paragraph to their submission letter to LPA confirming that to be the case.	
DSCI0013/06	Alan Hunter	English Heritage	3.6	3.6.2	Reference should be to 'Conservation Area Consent'		Make change.	Amend 7th bullet point to say "Listed Building and Conservation Area Consent"
DSCI0013/07	Alan Hunter	English Heritage	Appendix 1	-	It is important to include in the list of consultees the Amenity Bodies outlined in PPG15 (Planning and the Historic Environment) as they have both a statutory and non-statutory role to play.		Contact Details for Amenity Bodies added to our Database and they will be consulted on LDF preparation and Applications where appropriate. Specific names not listed in Appendix 1 as if organisations merge or disband document will need to change often.	No Change
DSCI0013/08	Alan Hunter	English Heritage	Appendix 3	-	The Dev Control Charter deals with the question of amendments to planning applications. The charter should make it clear that obviously poor schemes will be refused where amendments would be so significant as to amount to a totally different proposal.		Provided that members of the affected community are aware that a scheme has been significantly changed, this is not considered to be a problem. This is why we re-consult.	No Change
DSCI0013/09	Alan Hunter	English Heritage	General	-	It is vital to include key partners in pre-application discussions, especially where they may have a statutory role later in the process.	EH are anxious to carry out more of this work to ensure that any difficulties or constraints can be identified at the earliest possible opportunity and solutions explored.	Noted. Where relevant, potential developers will be given contact details by the Planning Officer when identifying who to consult at pre-application stage.	No change
DSCI0013/10	Alan Hunter	English Heritage	General	-	The Council should make it clear that it will not process an application until all relevant information and details are received from the applicant. At present EH are forwarded wholly incomplete details on which they are required to comment.		Agree with Ethos, however comments relate to a different protocol, as not specifically concerned with community involvement in planning. Development Control endeavours to ensure Statutory Consultees are not asked to comment without sufficient details.	

REFERENCE NUMBER	NAME	ORGANISATION	SECTION	PARAGRAPH	COMMENTS	FURTHER COMMENTS	SBC RESPONSE	SBC CHANGES
DSCI0013/11	Alan Hunter	English Heritage	General	-	EH supports the move to e-government, but would welcome large documents, especially those with tables and plans, to be sent as hard copy. Such documents can be difficult to navigate electronically and printing can be wasteful.		Agree that printing can be wasteful and it is for that reason that SBC supports the move to e-government and greater efficiency. Comments seem to be contradictory as still want hard copies but want printing costs to be borne by the LPA.	No Change.
DSCI0013/12	Alan Hunter	English Heritage	General	-	The Council should prepare development briefs or design statements for sites which are expected to come forward through the planning process.		Agree. It is anticipated that when the Major Allocations DPD is adopted in 2008, development briefs will be prepared for each individual site contained in the document.	No change
DSCI0013/13	Alan Hunter	English Heritage	General	-	The Council does not have a list of buildings of local importance. The value of producing one cannot be overstated. Such an exercise can foster much in the way of community engagement in environmental matters.	Should the Council decide to undertake this work the method of public involvement should be set out in the SCI.	The Council is considering whether to produce such a document. Any consultation on the production of this document will be led by the SCI.	No Change
DSCI0013/14	Alan Hunter	English Heritage	General	-	In order to satisfy the new Best Value Performance Indicators there is a Council requirement to prepare/review conservation area character appraisals.	It is important that the SCI includes the necessary public consultation process to ensure that the statements and management plans fully engage local communities.	Conservation Area Appraisals will be SPDs, and will involve the community as per consultation methods set out in Appendix 2.	No change
DSCI0014/01	John Hedley	Architecture Liaison Officer	3 & 4	3.0.1 & 4.1.1	Supports principles of PPS1 and considers it important that the Police Architectural Liaison Officer is consulted at the earliest stage of development to enable his expertise to be incorporated within the design.	This will also ensure that the design meets with the requirements of Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 and the Human Rights Act 1998. Subsequent need to be upgraded from 'other consultee's' to a higher level of consultation.	Council as LPA does not have delegated powers to change the status of a consultee. However PALO is present at the Council's One Stop Shop and subsequently is 'consulted' on every planning application, albeit not as a statutory consultee.	No Change.
DSCI0015/01	Marie Higgins	Sport England	General	-	Ideally the draft SCI would detail Sport England's entire role within the Planning System, but pragmatically it is recognised that the document	in both the Development Plan preparation and on planning applications.	Whilst supportive of Sport England's involvement in the planning process, it would be difficult to go to the level	No change

REFERENCE NUMBER	NAME	ORGANISATION	SECTION	PARAGRAPH	COMMENTS	FURTHER COMMENTS	SBC RESPONSE	SBC CHANGES
					needs to be kept at a manageable length. Compromise to use SE as an example of a Statutory Consultee involved		of detail requested by Sport England for all consultees without the document becoming exceptionally long and unwieldy.	
DSCI0015/02S	Marie Higgins	Sport England	General	-	The draft SCI is basically sound in that it identifies Sport England in Appendix 1 as an 'Other Consultee' in the preparation of local development documents.		Noted.	No change
DSCI0015/03	Marie Higgins	Sport England	General	-	SE provided a supplementary sheet outlining their role in the planning system and the occasions and criteria for when they should be consulted.		Supplementary sheet will provide a useful resource to both Forward Planning and Development Control as it provides in depth details of the proposals and documents Sport England would like to be involved in.	No change but photocopy document for Development Control and Forward Planning use.
DSCI0016/01	Sylvia Dodsworth	SBC	Appendix 5	2 & 9	Reference to Director of Planning and Technical Services need to be amended.		Agree.	Change to Director of Neighbourhood Services
DSCI0016/02	Sylvia Dodsworth	SBC	General	-	The Tenant Participation Section currently works with 18 Resident Groups across the Borough as well as the Tenants Housing Services Group and Sedgefield Residents Association. Contact details available for community consultation.		Noted. The contact details of the 18 Resident Groups, Tenants Housing Services Group and Sedgefield Residents Association will be added to consultation database held by the Forward Planning Team, and contacted on proposal affecting them.	No change
DSCI0017/01	Phil Ball	SBC	2	2.2.1	The information regarding the availability of other formats of the SCI should be featured on the front page of the document rather than only in section 2.2.1.		Agree that information regarding the availability of the SCI should feature on the front page, however still appropriate for paragraph in Section 2 to remain as this clarifies the availability of Local Development Documents during production of Local Development Framework,	Revised document amended accordingly.
DSCI0017/02	Phil Ball	SBC	General	-	Can formal representations on the SCI be made in other formats apart from writing?		We request that comments be made in writing because if detailed comments are	No change

REFERENCE NUMBER	NAME	ORGANISATION	SECTION	PARAGRAPH	COMMENTS	FURTHER COMMENTS	SBC RESPONSE	SBC CHANGES
							made in other formats they are open to officer interpretation and possibly result in a person's comments being misrepresented. Written representations reduce this margin of error	
DSCI0018/01	Graham Darby	SBC	General	-	A Plain English version of the document would be useful.		Agree that Plain English version of the SCI would be useful.	Seek to produce Plain English summary version of the SCI once it has been formally adopted.
DSCI0019/01	Mr. L Oliver	Trimdon Parish Council	General	-	The Parish Council considers its preferred method of consultation to be for a public meeting to be held in each of the villages (Trimdon Village, Trimdon Colliery, Trimdon Grange) followed by a further meeting with the Parish Council.		Comments noted. SBC has limited staff resources. Will need to assess how to make the most effective use of these resources when undertaking consultation with the community	No change
DSCI0020/01	John Parkinson	Mordon Parish Council	General	-	The submission of Planning Applications seems to work well. However, retrospective applications and their final resolutions do not seem to get the critical attention they require.		This is a specific planning issue and not primarily about public involvement in planning.	No change
DSCI0020/02	John Parkinson	Mordon Parish Council	General	-	Renewable Energy does not cause a great deal of concern to ourselves, but the removal of the test tower at Grindon seems to indicate wind power will not be coming here.	The broader issue of Nuclear Power Generation as the only really viable option for the future is not one to be discussed here.	This is a specific planning issue and not primarily about public involvement in planning.	No change
DSCI0020/03	John Parkinson	Mordon Parish Council	General	-	Transport and Accessibility is a major concern in rural areas and one that Sedgfield Borough has not addressed for us and is of major concern to the aging population.		This is a specific planning issue and not primarily about public involvement in planning.	No change
DSCI0020/04	John Parkinson	Mordon Parish Council	General	-	Residential Extensions appears to work quite well, although the appeal process is pathetic with no body to talk to in the event of queries. Planning guidelines need to be much more readily accessible to the general public.		This is a specific planning issue and not primarily about public involvement in planning.	No change
DSCI0020/05	John Parkinson	Mordon Parish Council	General	-	Landscape Character is a very subjective field, and can cause many problems if not handled	Safeguarding Railway Lines is a very pertinent subject with regard to the	This is a specific planning issue and not primarily about public involvement in	No change

REFERENCE NUMBER	NAME	ORGANISATION	SECTION	PARAGRAPH	COMMENTS	FURTHER COMMENTS	SBC RESPONSE	SBC CHANGES
					sensitively. For instance the recent behaviour of the Environment Agency regarding the flooding of Mordon Carrs is a case in point.	above.	planning.	
DSCI0020/06	John Parkinson	Mordon Parish Council	General	-	Car Parking is a thorny issue as we have a registered village green on which no car parking is (technically) allowed. However there are some locations where the car must be left outside the premises.		This is a specific planning issue and not primarily about public involvement in planning.	No change
DSCI0020/07	John Parkinson	Mordon Parish Council	General	-	In the village of Bradbury car parking is causing major problems as people are leaving cars on the road during the day, which results in dangerous overtaking. We have tried for years to get a 30 MPH limit in our village. Please see what you can do.		This is a specific planning issue and not primarily about public involvement in planning.	No change
DSCI0020/08	John Parkinson	Mordon Parish Council	General	-	Enforcement of planning rules has caused us problems in the past. It is vital that you as the authority enforce the rules you have implemented and do not just hope the problem will go away.		This is a specific planning issue and not primarily about public involvement in planning.	No change
DSCI0021/01S	David Rixson	Vincent and Gorbing	General	-	Our Company's details should remain on your consultation list for all relevant stages of Local Development Framework.		Noted.	No change
DSCI0022/01	Andrew Quain	Sedgefield Borough Business Service	2	2.2.1	Information or a link could be placed on the SBBS website.		Agree.	Request change to SBBS website.
DSCI0022/02	Andrew Quain	Sedgefield Borough Business Service	2	2.3.2	Include representatives of the Sedgefield Business Forum; LSP Economy Policy Group; Town Centre Forums and Chambers of Trade.		Advisory Panel needs to be manageable. Would be inappropriate to over-balance members of group to promote economic interests over social and environmental.	The issue of an Advisory Panel will be discussed with the Cabinet. The outcome of this discussion will need to be agreed with the Council to take issue forward. Propose no change but keep situation under review.
DSCI0022/03	Andrew Quain	Sedgefield Borough Business Service	2	2.7.4	Information could be circulated via Business in Focus; placed on the SBBS website; via the Sedgefield Business Forum and LSP Economy Policy Group.		Agree.	Document amended accordingly. Need to liaise with Economic Development to ensure that this mechanism of consultation is fully explored.

REFERENCE NUMBER	NAME	ORGANISATION	SECTION	PARAGRAPH	COMMENTS	FURTHER COMMENTS	SBC RESPONSE	SBC CHANGES
DSCI0022/04	Andrew Quain	Sedgefield Borough Business Service	2	2.7.11	Include links to the SBBS website.		Agree.	Document amended accordingly.
DSCI0022/05	Andrew Quain	Sedgefield Borough Business Service	2	2.7.15	Include Sedgefield and LSP Economy Policy Group. Could also include the Town Centre Forums and Chambers of Trade.		The existing networks listed in this paragraph are only examples and not intended to provide an exhaustive definitive list. However, will add these additional groups to emphasise additional forums which can be tapped in to for greater involvement.	Amend document accordingly.
DSCI0022/06	Andrew Quain	Sedgefield Borough Business Service	3	3.2.1	Could also refer to other SBC Service Areas i.e. Economic Development.		Agree that other SBC departments are important consultees to aid in determination of applications. However, this is an internal issue and does not require any changes	No change
DSCI0022/07	Andrew Quain	Sedgefield Borough Business Service	4	4.3.1	Would it be appropriate to include a reference to Section 106 Agreements? It provides an opportunity for SBC to work with developers on sustainability issues i.e. transport; car parking; materials used in building construction etc.	It can also be used to improve the quality of landscaping; employment of local residents etc.	Agree. It is the Borough's intention to ensure that the community is consulted on all s106 expenditure. The Authority will shortly be appointing consultants to undertake an Open Space Needs Assessment of all formal/informal areas of open space throughout the Borough. Part of the remit of this study is likely to require the consultants to utilise suitable consultation methods to enable engagement with the community to identifying current shortfalls/over provision of open space, and also what improvements the community would like to see provided by the spending of s106 monies.	No Change.
DSCI0022/08	Andrew Quain	Sedgefield Borough Business Service	Appendix 1		Other consultees could include: SBBS; Sedgefield Business Forum; LSP Economy Policy group; County Durham Economic Partnership;		These Organisations are included in Appendix 1 as they fall within the 'General Consultation Bodies' whose	No Change.

REFERENCE NUMBER	NAME	ORGANISATION	SECTION	PARAGRAPH	COMMENTS	FURTHER COMMENTS	SBC RESPONSE	SBC CHANGES
					County Durham Development Company; Federation of Small Businesses; Chambers of Trade; Town Centre Forums.		details are held by the authority.	
DSCI0022/09	Andrew Quain	Sedgefield Borough Business Service	Appendix 2		The Consultation Method Index for both businesses and developers could also include: SBBS website; Business in Focus Newsletter; press releases; Sedgefield Business Forum; LSP Economy Policy Group; Town Centre Forums and Chambers of Trade.		Agree.	Appendix 2 amended to include consultation methods suggested.
DSCI0023/01S	Pat Graham	Teesdale District Council	General	-			Support of document noted.	No change
DSCI0024/01S	John Robinson	Sedgefield Arts Regeneration Community Association	General	-	We would welcome the strategy and would ask to register as a community consultee with consultation documents sent to the above address.		Noted.	Organisation added to 'General Consultation Bodies' listed in Appendix 1, and contact details added to consultation database. Will be notified of all document issued for consultation.
DSCI0025/01	David Salkeld	Camtec Properties (Newton Aycliffe) Ltd	2.7	2.7.7	This description of Masterplanning is very one-dimensional. It seems public sector oriented. The market for land does not operate in this way. Camtec as landowners have appointed their professional team. It comprises recognised planning, landscape,	engineering and other consultants. Camtec is however fully prepared to have community involvement by publicising development options. To this end it has undertaken a community questionnaire of residents near to Woodham Burn.	Masterplanning is given as an example of a community involvement method which could be used. It will not be the most appropriate method for every proposal which requires public involvement.	No change.
DSCI0025/02	David Salkeld	Camtec Properties (Newton Aycliffe) Ltd	2	2.3.2	The appointment of the advisory panel should be made as a result of the issues arising out of Issues Paper #2 published in June 2005. For example, this will establish the flooding of Woodham Burn and its proposed solution as a major issue.	Ward councillors, a member of Great Aycliffe Parish Council, neighbours on Cheltenham Way and the developer could be invited to form a caucus to feed into the SCI.	Comments relate to specific planning issues concerning a particular site in the Borough, and are not primarily about the overall strategy of public involvement in planning.	No change
DSCI0025/03S	David Salkeld	Camtec Properties (Newton Aycliffe) Ltd	4	4.4.1	Camtec supports open house events as a means of engaging with the community. This will stop rumours about developer's intentions and set out the plans for the site. It will also	to reflect community concerns. Camtec proposes to hold an open house event following its questionnaire survey and	Comments noted.	No change

REFERENCE NUMBER	NAME	ORGANISATION	SECTION	PARAGRAPH	COMMENTS	FURTHER COMMENTS	SBC RESPONSE	SBC CHANGES
					by means of a follow up, indicate the changes made to a scheme to a scheme	before the Development Plan Documents are published in 2006.		
DSCI0025/04S	David Salkeld	Camtec Properties (Newton Aycliffe) Ltd	4	4.3.1	Camtec believes its proposals for Woodham Burn to be a large-medium scale development with opportunities for community benefit as stated in this section.		Comments relate to specific planning issues concerning a particular site in the Borough, and are not primarily about the overall strategy of public involvement in planning.	No change
DSCI0025/05S	David Salkeld	Camtec Properties (Newton Aycliffe) Ltd	4	4.1.1	Camtec has taken on board the need for pre-application discussions (and pre-representation to LDF discussions). It has consulted with the community by its questionnaire at an early stage.		Comments relate to specific planning issues concerning a particular site in the Borough, and are not primarily about the overall strategy of public involvement in planning.	No change
DSCI0025/06S	David Salkeld	Camtec Properties (Newton Aycliffe) Ltd	2	2.7.8	Camtec welcomes the planning focus meetings. It has had many officer meetings about the Woodham Burn site which lacked focus from members or from the community. There is however, a danger that the urban capacity study, flood study undertaken by the	Council and Open Space Audit may sieve out sites before members and the community have had them brought to their attention.	Comments relate to specific planning issues concerning a particular site in the Borough, and are not primarily about the overall strategy of public involvement in planning.	No change
DSCI0025/07S	David Salkeld	Camtec Properties (Newton Aycliffe) Ltd	2	2.6.1	Camtec welcomes the groups targeted for consultation to include developers/land owners such as themselves who are key stakeholders in the Borough.		Comments noted.	No change
DSCI0026/01	Paul Stephens	SBC - Regeneration	General	-	The SCI needs to set out a clearer and more positive vision for how the community will be involved in the development of the LDDs, akin to that set out for planning applications. This is too vague in the draft.		Agree	Introduce new paragraph at start of Chapter 2 to address this issue.
DSCI0026/02	Paul Stephens	SBC - Regeneration	General	-	Unclear whether the document aims to increase community involvement in planning or simply list the channels that will be available. If the former, then could say more on promotion.		Comments noted	Introductory paragraph to Chapter 2 will address issue.
DSCI0026/03	Paul Stephens	SBC - Regeneration	General	-	The language of the document is very technical and so would be intimidating to its intended audience.		SCI is a technical document. It is suggested that a Plain English summary version of	Seek to produce Plain English summary version of the SCI once it has

REFERENCE NUMBER	NAME	ORGANISATION	SECTION	PARAGRAPH	COMMENTS	FURTHER COMMENTS	SBC RESPONSE	SBC CHANGES
					Also there is some repetition, grammatical and spelling errors which should be addressed to promote clarity. Is Crystal Marking an option?		the SCI will be produced as part of the Submitted SCI consultation	been formally adopted.
DSCI0026/04	Paul Stephens	SBC - Regeneration	Test of Soundness	-	Does document set out how SCI links with other community involvement initiatives? No - P.10/2.1 suggests that a separate document will be produced. Is this appropriate? Strategy and Regeneration, as lead on Community Strategy and community engagement,	should be involved in the development of this content, which should be within SCI. Document needs to make clear (front cover) that it is the SCI for Planning and not all Council services. This will avoid confusion with other documents.	Comments noted. However, a separate document will be produced by Planning Services showing how the LDF will provide the spatial interpretation of the Community Strategy.	Amend front cover to clarify role of SCI.
DSCI0026/05	Paul Stephens	SBC - Regeneration	Test of Soundness	-	Does the SCI identify which local community groups and other bodies need to be consulted? Mostly - provides generic list but does not include bodies specific to Sedgefield Borough by name. This would assist in making the document more meaningful to local	organisations. Appendix 1 not divided (as suggested at P7/1.3) into statutory, non-statutory and community consultees.	Government guidance states that whilst Statement's should include a 'long-list' of the types of groups the authority proposes to involve, it should not include specific names as this would change too quickly.	No Change.
DSCI0026/06	Paul Stephens	SBC - Regeneration	Test of Soundness	-	Does the SCI demonstrate how local people can be involved in a timely and accessible manner? Yes - but quite vague, listing methods and suggesting how they might be used rather than how it ill happen in an integrated way.	Flow charts or a worked example might assist in presenting this information in an easily digestible manner.	The Local Development Scheme provides a comprehensive list of the documents that are being prioritised for production. Appendix 2 provides a guide for the methods of consultation that will be used when consulting upon these documents	Clarify issue in new introductory paragraph to Chapter 2.
DSCI0026/07S	Paul Stephens	SBC - Regeneration	Test of Soundness	-	Does the SCI show that the methods to be used to involve people, community groups and other bodies are suitable for the different stages in the preparation of SBC's Local Development Documents? Yes - in main body and at Appendix 2.	Does the merged row at the top of columns 3/4 in Appendix 2 need to be stretched to cover column 2?	Noted.	Amend Appendix 2 accordingly
DSCI0026/08	Paul Stephens	SBC - Regeneration	Test of Soundness	-	Does the SCI show that Sedgefield Borough Council can resource and manage the process effectively? No - provides assurance but not evidence (e.g. indication of extent of	resourced from the current establishment).	The Local Development Scheme provides this guidance. Each individual consultation exercise will be tailored to ensure effective	Amend text in paragraph 1.8 to address issue.

REFERENCE NUMBER	NAME	ORGANISATION	SECTION	PARAGRAPH	COMMENTS	FURTHER COMMENTS	SBC RESPONSE	SBC CHANGES
					consultation to be undertaken, working hours required and whether this can be		consultation in light of available staff resources.	
DSCI0026/09	Paul Stephens	SBC - Regeneration	Test of Soundness	-	Does the SCI show how the results of the community involvement are to be fed into the preparation of development plan documents and supplementary planning documents? Yes - but does not set out how validity of comments will be judged and under what	circumstances they might be acted upon. Need to ensure that all consultations make clear at the outset what can be changed through community involvement. This is particularly important in planning, where there is limited flexibility.	Issue is addressed in paragraph 2.10.1 of the Submission Draft SCI.	No change
DSCI0026/10	Paul Stephens	SBC - Regeneration	Test of Soundness	-	Does the SCI set out the mechanism for reviewing procedures? No - sets out timescales but not mechanisms.		Issue is addressed in Local Development Scheme and paragraph 1.9 of the Submission Draft SCI.	No change
DSCI0026/11S	Paul Stephens	SBC - Regeneration	Test of Soundness	-	Does the SCI clearly describe the planning authority's policy for consultation on planning applications? Yes - clear and positive, the strongest element of the draft Statement.		Noted.	No change
DSCI0026/12	Paul Stephens	SBC - Regeneration	2	2.3.2	Clarify meaning of 'minority group member'.		The requirement and composition will be discussed with Cabinet.	The issue of an Advisory Panel will be discussed with the Cabinet. The outcome of this discussion will need to be agreed with the Council to take issue forward. Propose no change but keep situation under review.
DSCI0026/13	Paul Stephens	SBC - Regeneration	2	2.5.1	Clarify how Parish Plans will be taken into account (where they exist).		Will need to liaise with Council on the production of such documents. Parish Plans will have to be subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment and Sustainability Appraisal, should the Town/Parish Council wish to see the document viewed as SPD.	Parish Plans would need to be identified in Local Development Scheme, not SCI. No change.
DSCI0026/14	Paul Stephens	SBC - Regeneration	2	2.7.11	Ensure e-consultations undertaken in line with developing corporate		Comments noted. Need to ensure that SCI is	No change

REFERENCE NUMBER	NAME	ORGANISATION	SECTION	PARAGRAPH	COMMENTS	FURTHER COMMENTS	SBC RESPONSE	SBC CHANGES
					approach and also make use of recently purchased e-survey software.		undertaken within corporate approach	
DSCI0026/15	Paul Stephens	SBC - Regeneration	2	2.7.15	LSP Panels/Community Forums - does this mean LSP Policy Groups and Area Forums?		Yes. Change text in paragraph	Amend paragraph 2.7.15
DSCI0027/01	Karin Johnson	Sustainable Communities Team, SBC	1	1.7	The consultation methods to be used at each stage of the LDF are quite extensive when considered against the limited resources that may be available to the Forward Planning Team. Will Action Plans be drawn up in advance in order to identify each method of	consultation; associated timescales; lead officers responsible and other officers involved in delivering the consultation methods? Such actions plans would help to identify early on; the need for the involvement of other officers; where extra resources...	Comments noted. SBC has limited staff resources. Will need to assess how to make the most effective use of these resources when undertaking consultation with the community	No change
DSCI0027/01cont	Karin Johnson	Sustainable Communities Team, SBC	1	1.7	...are required and/or where timescales need to be adjusted so as to ensure that as many of the appropriate consultation methods stated are planned for and applied in a timely and effective manner. If action planning is to take place, it should be	expressed in the SCI to satisfy the test of soundness. Such action planning would help to secure assistance from other staff within NS's and across the Council by allowing Managers to be informed in advance and staff work programmes to be altered.	Comments noted. SBC has limited staff resources. Will need to assess how to make the most effective use of these resources when undertaking consultation with the community	No change
DSCI0027/02	Karin Johnson	Sustainable Communities Team, SBC	2	2.7.15	The soon to be established 'Environment Hub' is a key group within the LSP network that Planning Officers may wish to engage in.		Comments noted. Once group is established, Planning Officers will attend meetings to extend knowledge of LDF preparation.	No change
DSCI0027/03	Karin Johnson	Sustainable Communities Team, SBC	Appendix 1	-	Sustainable Communities Team can provide details of further local environmental groups. Local Agenda 21 should be replaced with Sustainable Communities Team as LA21 strategy is obsolete as was subsumed into Community Strategy in accordance with the Local	Government Act 2000.	Noted.	The contact details of the further local environmental groups will be added to consultation database held by the Forward Planning Team, and contacted on proposal affecting them. Changes made to revised draft to acknowledge obsolete role of LA21.

REFERENCE NUMBER	NAME	ORGANISATION	SECTION	PARAGRAPH	COMMENTS	FURTHER COMMENTS	SBC RESPONSE	SBC CHANGES
DSCI0027/04	Karin Johnson	Sustainable Communities Team, SBC	General	-	The document should be printed on minimum 75% Post Consumer Waste and TCF/NAPM approved recycled paper. This should be clearly stated on the back cover.		Comments noted. Feasibility of this will be discussed with printers responsible for producing revised document to establish whether use of this paper will have an impact on the publishing costs.	No change
DSCI0027/05	Karin Johnson	Sustainable Communities Team, SBC	General	-	Typographical errors throughout the document have been highlighted to the Forward Planning Team.		Comments noted.	Changes made to revised document.
DSCI0028/01	Ken Pritchard	Bishop Middleham Parish Council	General	-	In producing the LDF, the issues affecting Bishop Middleham will attract interest from the Parish Council. It is hoped therefore, that in the spirit of true consultation, valid points offered for serious consideration will be accommodated. In cases where	the Borough Council is unable to accept a parish point of view, a written explanation should be supplied detailing why it has not been possible to incorporate a parish perspective in the final version of the LDF. If this arises, is appeal possible?	Comments noted. As explained in paragraph 2.9.1, we will provide a response to all consultation responses. If Parish Council comments are not taken forward, issues could be addressed through the public examination	No change
DSCI0028/02	Ken Pritchard	Bishop Middleham Parish Council	Development Control	-	In terms of Dev Cont, the Parish considers it important that correspondence is acknowledged in good time, thus obviating the need to press for a written response. When it is not possible to accommodate objections (or support) for a particular planning	application, it is important that Dev Cont colleagues respond with a written explanation. This would help to relieve some of the tension at parish level should it seem that carefully considered responses to a consultation exercise have been disregarded.	All representations made receive a written response confirming their views have been received. Where a decision taken does not agree with the comments made by a Parish, the Council will explain why in a letter	No change
DSCI0029/01	Alan Etherington		General	-	I have noted the comments contained in the draft Statement of Community Involvement. May I inform you that I have agreed a Land Purchase Option with Alexander Developments (North East) Ltd. Formal representation at the submission stage will be made	through their own appointed Planning Consultants on my behalf. As part of the strategy for public consultations I will be happy to be involved and follow the council's formal procedures in these matters.	Comments relate to specific planning issues concerning a particular site in the Borough, and are not primarily about the overall strategy of public involvement in planning.	Agreement to follow the consultation procedures set out in SCI is noted.
DSCI0030/01	Ian Radley - Planning Manager	Highways Agency	General	-	The HA would wish to ensure that notwithstanding the need for speed in processing applications, we would need to be consulted on any		Comments noted. Highways Agency will continue to be consulted on any proposals/schemes which	No change

REFERENCE NUMBER	NAME	ORGANISATION	SECTION	PARAGRAPH	COMMENTS	FURTHER COMMENTS	SBC RESPONSE	SBC CHANGES
					documentation/proposal which could have direct or indirect implications for the trunk road network.		will have either a direct or indirect impact on the trunk road network.	
DSCI0030/02	Ian Radley - Planning Manager	Highways Agency	General	-	It would be helpful if all representation made could be listed in the actual document concerned, not solely within the Community Involvement and Responses Statement.		There are practical problems with this suggestion. If comments are included within a planning document, they can then themselves become the subject of objections. The existing arrangements ensure policy is considered separately from process.	No change
DSCI0030/03	Ian Radley - Planning Manager	Highways Agency	General	-	It is not clear whether the Agency will be included in the pre-application discussions for applications benefiting from community involvement. Could a mechanism for involvement be established? As it would be advantageous to reduce lengthy representations	at the application stage.	Noted. Where relevant, potential developers will be given contact details by the Planning Officer when identifying who to consult at pre-application stage.	No change
DSCI0030/04	Ian Radley - Planning Manager	Highways Agency	General	-	The Agency would ask for clarification on how representations made by them with regard to any draft LDD or pre-application will be responded to.		All comments received on LDDs and DC issues are acknowledged in writing. Where relevant, the comments are taken into consideration. In relation to DC, comments will be assessed and used in determination process	No change. Issue is addressed in paragraph 2.9.1
DSCI0030/05	Ian Radley - Planning Manager	Highways Agency	General	-	The Agency would suggest that the 'pre-application consultation guidelines' be worded more strongly, requesting that it is carried out, and that you provide more specific details on what types of development would benefit from community involvement.	Also clearer advice on how what and where such consultations is carried out, and how the results are recorded. It would also be of assistance if this information could be used as supporting information for the planning application.	Agree. However whilst the SCI encourages pre-application discussions and early community consultation on significant applications, the LA cannot refuse to validate an application because of the failure to consult prior to submission.	No change
DSCI0031/01	Gareth Hunter	GO-NE	General	-	The submission SCI should briefly explain the consultation steps undertaken to comply with Regulations 25 and 26.		The Submitted SCI will be accompanied by an additional 'Statement of Pre-Submission Consultation'	Provide wording in the Submitted SCI to address issue.

REFERENCE NUMBER	NAME	ORGANISATION	SECTION	PARAGRAPH	COMMENTS	FURTHER COMMENTS	SBC RESPONSE	SBC CHANGES
							document explaining the consultation undertaken during the production of the SCI (to comply with the Regulations 28 of the Town & Country Planning Regulations 2004).	
DSCI0031/02	Gareth Hunter	GO-NE	General	-	In terms of the document's presentation, I would suggest the following may be useful in the build up to a submission SCI. Page 1, 7 and of the draft point to future timescales for SCI production and the relationship with DPDs. Perhaps greater explanation	of the LDS in identifying key dates and milestones would be helpful.	Comments noted.	Introductory paragraph to Chapter 2 will address issue.
DSCI0031/03	Gareth Hunter	GO-NE	General	-	Consider making greater use of diagrams and illustrations within the document where they serve to aid rather than confuse understanding of any process, for example, the SCI diagram within PPS12 (Creating LDFs) albeit with some additional explanation of	the approach taken by Sedgefield. Perhaps also the SCI contents page could be made more navigable by grouping items under generic sub-headings.	Comments noted	Submitted SCI will address issue
DSCI0032/01	Andy Coulthard	Regeneration - SBC	General	-	My initial concern is that it is a very difficult read - very wordy, technical in places and with no graphics or photographs to break it up.		Comments noted. Greater care taken with revised document to ensure that use of acronyms is kept to a minimum, and photographs have been inserted to make document more appealing to its intended audience.	Seek to produce Plain English summary version of the SCI once it has been formally adopted.
DSCI0032/02	Andy Coulthard	Regeneration - SBC	General	-	From a young persons perspective, it was difficult to grasp the reason for the document. Is it to show the different methods of which the community could be consulted? Is it trying to say this is how we are going to communicate in the future?	Or is it a document for documents sake?	Comments noted.	Revised document contains greater clarification as to the documents intentions.
DSCI0032/03	Andy Coulthard	Regeneration - SBC	General	-	There is very little, if any reference made to involving young people and as a very large percentage of the Borough are young people (25%) this should be addressed more. I talked to them about the development of planning within	contexts of planning and they agreed that this would be a positive step and should be mentioned more within this document.	Issue is being specifically addressed through the joint appointment with other districts of a Community Outreach worker.	No change

REFERENCE NUMBER	NAME	ORGANISATION	SECTION	PARAGRAPH	COMMENTS	FURTHER COMMENTS	SBC RESPONSE	SBC CHANGES
					schools and the various			
DSCI0032/04	Andy Coulthard	Regeneration - SBC	General	-	Looking at the cover I thought it was a corporate document for SBC and not for Planning.		Comments noted.	Revised document clarifies that the SCI is not a corporate document for SBC, but rather a Planning document which sets out the methods and reasoning for public involvement in planning.
DSCI0032/05	Andy Coulthard	Regeneration - SBC	General	-	What is planning? This would make a good introduction and would help people gauge how important planning is in their every day lives.		Comments noted.	Provide link to ODPM guide in introduction.
DSCI0032/06	Andy Coulthard	Regeneration - SBC	General	-	Is this a national template which you have used? Needs to be made more localised, include examples and references to more local community contacts etc.		Comments noted. Local groups can form/disband quickly. It is important therefore that the SCI is generic in this respect.	No change.
DSCI0032/07	Andy Coulthard	Regeneration - SBC	General	-	Possible use of flow diagrams could break up the wording, Pictures and graphics tend to explain so much more and make it easier to understand.		Comments noted	Will use graphics to explain process in Submitted SCI
DSCI0032/08	Andy Coulthard	Regeneration - SBC	General	-	Why not develop a summary or even produce a statement of intent.		Agree	Seek to produce Plain English summary version of the SCI once it has been formally adopted.
DSCI0033/01	Miss Katie Lazzam	Malcolm Judd & Partners	General	-	Company monitors all development plans in England & Wales on behalf of National Grid Transco. We would prefer to be involved at the outset of establishing a policy that can be used by the authority to guide development. Therefore, we can be of	assistance to you in providing informal comments in confidence during your policy development. We have a wealth of experience in this area and would be able to provide examples of policies used in development plans elsewhere in country.	Comments noted. Will notify as part of other LDD consultation exercises.	No change
DSCI0034/01	Paul Frank	County Durham & Tees Valley Strategic Health Auth	2.2	2.2.1	Regarding access to information on P10, how do you intend to cater for people who require information in different formats (i.e. different languages, Braille, audio, large font etc). It would seem sensible to put a	page of this document, offering different formats. Consideration should be given as to whether this statement should be in different (core) languages	Comments noted.	Revised document contains details of the alternative languages the statement is available in.

REFERENCE NUMBER	NAME	ORGANISATION	SECTION	PARAGRAPH	COMMENTS	FURTHER COMMENTS	SBC RESPONSE	SBC CHANGES
					statement at either the front or back	and large font etc. Other than that, overall the statement appears comprehensive.		
DSCI0035/01	Harry Robinson	Eldon Parish Council	General	-	Eldon Parish Council considers the whole new planning process to be too complex and unlikely to be understood by the majority of the general public.		Comments noted, although not specifically related to public participation in planning.	Seek to produce Plain English summary version of the SCI once it has been formally adopted.
DSCI0035/02	Harry Robinson	Eldon Parish Council	General	-	EPC appreciates that the new system is being imposed by central government and that Sedgfield Borough Council has no choice but to conform. The draft SCI is reasonable but EPC feels it is unlikely to advance the involvement of 'communities' in the	planning process. More 'negotiation' with 'communities' and less 'consultation' is needed. The latter pays lip service to the concept of 'community' involvement but in the event 'community' views tend to be ignored, especially in delegated decisions.	The Parish Council has raised the issue previously with ODPM. ODPM has clarified that the Borough Council is the appropriate body to decide upon planning issues.	No change
DSCI0035/03	Harry Robinson	Eldon Parish Council	General	-	EPC's interest is mainly with the role Parish Councils will play in the new system and it feels an opportunity has been missed to make Parish Councils 'negotiators' instead of 'consultees'. In this sense the new system is just the same as the old.	As elected representatives of residents at a grassroots level Parish Councillors know their areas more intimately than Borough Councillors or Planning Officials and should have a formal role in the planning system. Otherwise PC has little point.	The Parish Council has raised the issue previously with ODPM. ODPM has clarified that the Borough Council is the appropriate body to decide upon planning issues.	No change
DSCI0035/04	Harry Robinson	Eldon Parish Council	General	-	The failure to properly involve Parishes is especially evident in 'Chapter 3: Community Involvement on Development Control Matters'; 'Appendix 3: SBC Development Control Service Charter'; Appendix 4: SBC Planning Enforcement Charter'; and in	'Appendix 5: SBC - Public Speaking at Development Control Committee'.	The Parish Council has raised the issue previously with ODPM. ODPM has clarified that the Borough Council is the appropriate body to decide upon planning issues.	No change
DSCI0035/05	Harry Robinson	Eldon Parish Council	3	-	The present & proposed 'consultation' approach is probably satisfactory for strategic planning applications which affect the wider SBC or Regional area, and where the committee would decide the	importance and affect residents of only one parish, should give the parish council the opportunity to be involved in that delegated decision	The Parish Council has raised the issue previously with ODPM. ODPM has clarified that the Borough Council is the appropriate body to decide upon	No change

REFERENCE NUMBER	NAME	ORGANISATION	SECTION	PARAGRAPH	COMMENTS	FURTHER COMMENTS	SBC RESPONSE	SBC CHANGES
					outcome. Delegated applications which have no strategic	and take part in negotiations with the applicant and planning officials.	planning issues.	
DSCI0035/06	Harry Robinson	Eldon Parish Council	Appendix 3	-	Parish Councils could be involved as 'negotiators' if and as necessary in just the same way as developers. This involvement could be coordinated with the content of 'Chapter 4: Recommended Community Involvement to be Undertaken by Developers and Agents'.		The Parish Council has raised the issue previously with ODPM. ODPM has clarified that the Borough Council is the appropriate body to decide upon planning issues.	No change
DSCI0035/07	Harry Robinson	Eldon Parish Council	Appendix 4	-	EPC considers that this Charter is too vague and open to 'not in the public interest' and 'lack of resources' being used as excuses for inaction, as happens at the moment. EPC also feels that Parish Councils, if and when they wish, could usefully have a	role as 'negotiators' in this area too, being in a better position to judge the deleterious effects on their residents of unauthorised development and developers' failures to abide by planning conditions.	The Parish Council has raised the issue previously with ODPM. ODPM has clarified that the Borough Council is the appropriate body to decide upon planning issues.	No change
DSCI0035/08	Harry Robinson	Eldon Parish Council	Appendix 5	-	Parish Councils in the current system have no more rights than their residents at these committee meetings, unless a Parish Councillor also happens to be a SBC member, and even then that member is hide-bound by the onerous 'interest' rules. Appendix 5	fails to address this problem and EPC would like to see a Parish Councillor allowed to represent a Parish's views at committee meetings if that Parish so wished, especially on delegated items affecting only that Parish which are referred to committee.	The Parish Council has raised the issue previously with ODPM. ODPM has clarified that the Borough Council is the appropriate body to decide upon planning issues.	No change
DSCI0036/01	Jenny Loring - Conservation Officer	English Nature	4	4.1	English Nature should be consulted at the earliest stage where protected species or designated nature conservation sites might be affected directly or indirectly by a developer.		Comments noted.	No change.

Appendix 3 – Statutory Advertisement in Local Press

Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 The Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004

Notice of Deposit of the Draft Statement of Community Involvement

Sedgefield Borough Council has prepared its Draft Statement of Community Involvement. The Draft Statement of Community Involvement sets out how the Council will engage with the community with respect to planning matters. When this Statement of Community Involvement is adopted, it will form part of the Local Development Framework for the area of Sedgefield Borough Council. The Local Development Framework forms the basis for decisions on land use planning affecting that area.

Copies of the Draft Statement of Community Involvement are available for public inspection, free of charge, from 11 April to 27 May 2005, at:

Sedgefield Borough Council Offices, Spennymoor	On Mondays -	8.30 am - 5.00
	Thursdays	pm
	Fridays	8.30 am - 4.30 pm

The Draft Statement of Community Involvement is also available on the Council's website at www.sedgefield.gov.uk

Objections to, and representations in respect of, the Draft Statement of Community Involvement should be sent in writing to the Forward Planning Team, Neighbourhood Services, Sedgefield Borough Council, Council Offices, Spennymoor, DL16 6JQ before 5.00pm on 27 May 2005. Objections and representations should specify the matters to which they relate and grounds on which they are made.

Further information is available from Forward Planning Team, on telephone 01388 816166 or via the website www.sedgefield.gov.uk

**Dennis Hall
Solicitor to the Council
Council Offices, Spennymoor**

11 April 2005

Appendix 4 - Press Release

Sedgefield Borough Local Development Framework: Draft Statement of Community Involvement

The Borough Council is seeking views from its community on its Draft Statement of Community Involvement. This document explains how the Council intends to engage with those who have an interest in planning issues affecting their community.

It is very important for the Council to work in partnership with the community to deliver sustainable development in the right place at the right time. Communities should be able to contribute their ideas to plan making and be involved in development proposals. The Draft Statement of Community Involvement sets out the proposed methods through which the community will be able to contribute to the process.

The Draft Statement of Community Involvement is to be placed on deposit, during the six-week period between 11 April and 23 May 2005 when representations, either objecting to or in support of the Statement, can be made. Any representation made should specify the matters to which they relate and grounds on which they are made.

Should you wish to make any representation, would you please complete a representation form and return it to the Forward Planning Team, Planning and Technical Services, Sedgefield Borough Council, Council Offices, Spennymoor, DL16 6JQ by 5pm on Monday 23 May 2005. Copies of the Draft Statement of Community Involvement and representation forms are available for inspections from the Borough Council Offices, or via the Council's website.

Should you require any further information, please do not hesitate to contact Chris Myers, Neil Culkin or Tom Bennett at the Borough Council.

