

## Schedule of representations to draft Statement of Community Involvement

*Note: underline of text denotes revisions, strikethrough of text denotes deletions*

The CBC comments will be incorporated into the Statement of Community Involvement, available on the Council's website. For further copies please contact Holly Jones on ext. 4379

Paragraph No/ Section	Respondent and Representation	CBC Response
<b>Draft Statement of Community Involvement March 2005</b>		
Appendix 1	<b>Guy Hunter</b> LDF form seems to invite objections rather than feedback or comments.	Disagree, the form is in a standard format which is used to capture any type of representation, be it positive or negative.
Appendix 1	It is unclear whether only legal representations are wanted.	All forms of representations are welcomed, whether supporting, commenting or objecting. Some respondents will choose to proceed with their objections through a planning agent or may use legal support at an inquiry stage.
Questions	General questions do not relate to the numbered points in the report	It is the intention that the general questions in the report relate to the theme which has been put forward in the text.
Q.1	E-mail should be included	Agree, the use of e-mail is considered to be a useful mechanism through which to contact the community. <b>Include e-mail in bullet point listing following paragraph 3.8.</b>
Q.2 & Appendix 6	Include the following as non-statutory consultees Federation of tenants and leaseholders Help the aged Tidy Cheltenham group Local Charities Gay Cheltenham Check Disabled forum and Cheltenham Disability Forum are not the same group.	Agree. <b>Include the groups as non-statutory consultees. Amend the consultees to include the Cheltenham Borough Council Disability Group and the Cheltenham Disability Forum.</b>
Q.3	Contact marketing department for techniques on contacting hard to reach groups.	There a number of methods the Council employ to contact hard to reach groups which are supported by the internal marketing department. Internal workshops and discussions have fed

		into the consultation methods highlighted.
Q.4	Onus should be on Council to make contact with groups and not rely on groups to read local papers. By using the methods outlined in question 1 and ensuring all groups are on the database should overcome this.	Agree that the Council should be contacting groups, but recognise that the extent of this may be limited to groups that we are aware of and are more active. It is not considered that an over-reliance is placed on local newspapers. A comprehensive mix of communication methods will be used to address this concern.
Q.4	Clarify what is meant by local press	Local press include the local radio stations, local newspapers and tv stations. Press releases are distributed widely to the local media in Gloucestershire.
Q.5	Include municipal buildings, offices with disabled access	Agree that such buildings would be suitable locations, but public consultation events should not be limited to these.
4.2	The neighbour notification covers too small an area in all cases	The requirements for neighbour notification are set out in the annex to Circular 15/92 and are considered to be any land which is conterminous within or within 4 metres of the boundary for which the development is proposed, but only if any part of such land is within 90 metres of any part of the development in question. The Borough Council exceeds these statutory requirements in its neighbour notification. In addition to this, any person who has submitted representations to a previous planning application is automatically informed.
Q.7	A wider consultation net for all applications	The Borough Council circulates neighbour notification letters to a much wider area than is statutorily required. See response to above comment.
5.1	Clarification needed to ensure that the Council will not work below the minimum regulations	The Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004 set out the minimum requirements of consultation. In the unlikely event that the Council fails to meet these regulations to meet these requirements, it may be subject to a legal or ombudsman challenge.
Q.8	Apply CBC salary rises in line with inflation	This is outside the remit of the SCI and LDF process.

Q.9	Clarify what help is needed, specify whether this is people, resources, equipment etc	Help in any form, whether it be in the form of people, resources, equipment, the provision of venues, intermediaries would be welcomed.
General	<b>South West Regional Development Agency</b> Support document	Support welcomed
General	<b>South West Regional Assembly</b> Support Document	Support welcomed
Section 2	Indicate that the RSS is being produced by the Assembly as the Regional Planning Body	Agree, amend paragraph 2.2 to read  “...will replace local plans, (see appendix 5). <u>The RSS is being produced by the South West Regional Assembly as the Regional Planning Body (RPB).</u> ”
Appendix 6	Indicate that the Assembly is the RPB	Agree, will include in brackets in list.
2.2	The LDF must be in ‘general conformity’ with the RSS, rather than in accordance.	Agree, amend text to read  “The Local Plan must be in accordance with national planning policy and <del>also</del> <u>must be in general conformity with the Regional Spatial Strategy.</u> ”
Appendix 6	Include Regen South West, South West and Tourism South West as non-statutory consultees	Agree, amend list of non-statutory consultees
General	<b>National Grid Transco</b> Keen to be involved in providing policy advice in development plan documents	Welcome assistance
Q.2	<b>Mr T Ilott</b> Effort should be made to include those with lower than average reading and writing skills and learning difficulties	Agree, The Council endeavour to write documents using plain English and avoiding jargon wherever possible. Include those with lower than average literacy skills in hard to reach groups.
3.17	A database should include individuals as well as well as interested groups	Agree, insert the following text after paragraph 3.5 and question 1.  <u>The Council maintains a database of statutory consultees, non-statutory consultees, interested bodies, community groups and individuals. Statutory consultees and non-statutory consultees are listed at appendix 6 of this document.</u>
Q.4	Though website is important, less emphasis	It is not considered that undue

	should be placed on it to reflect the fact that not everyone has internet access	emphasis has been placed on the use of the website. Though not everyone has direct access to the internet at home, the libraries in Gloucestershire offer free internet use.
4.19	Support the Council's efforts to consult with reference to tree applications, but feel that more could be done.	Agree. Insert the following text at the end of paragraph 4.18.  <u>The Council will consult the Cheltenham Tree Group and the Cheltenham Civic Society on any planning application which the Council's Senior Tree Officer is consulted on. This will include planning applications where it is identified that a TPO is present and any application where it is declared that trees are to be removed.</u>
Q.9	Approach neighbourhood watch groups and residents associations	Agree, neighbourhood watch groups and residents associations can be approached where known.
4.19	<b>Cheltenham Tree Group</b> Applications which involve works to trees, include felling should be brought to the attention of Cheltenham Tree Group. Cheltenham's Civic Society warden also needs to be informed of such applications.	Agree. Insert the following text at the end of paragraph 4.18.  <u>The Council will consult the Cheltenham Tree Group and the Cheltenham Civic Society on any planning application which the Council's Senior Tree Officer is consulted on. This will include planning applications where it is identified that a TPO is present and any application where it is declared that trees are to be removed.</u>
Appendix 6	Add Cheltenham Tree Group to non-statutory consultees	<u>Agree, amend list of non-statutory consultees</u>
Q.5	<b>Prestbury Parish Council</b> Too many of the public consultation locations are only open office hours, more flexibility is needed to allow access to documents	It is considered that the use of the internet will assist in this. Documents on public consultation are also available at libraries within Cheltenham. Public exhibitions will be arranged wherever possible, outside office hours to try to overcome this.
4.3	Support this aim	Support welcomed
4.4	Site notices should be used more widely	Site notices are a mandatory requirement for all applications involving listed buildings or applications within a conservation area. They are also used

		to advertise major applications. It is considered that the neighbour notification letter advises those who will be most directly affected by proposed development.
4.10	The minimum number of dwellings in an application before it is classed as significant should be reduced.	A proposal is considered to be major if there are 10 or more dwelling houses proposed and require an advertisement to be placed in the newspaper. It is not a statutory requirement to state what constitutes a significant application. The Borough Council has identified certain types of planning application at section 4.10 of the SCI which are considered to be significant and warrant extensive consultation.
4.15	14 days should be an absolute minimum for amendments. 21 days would be better to allow proper consultation.	This comment relates to amendments to planning applications. Given the eight week deadline for determining the majority of planning applications, it is not always practicable to allow for a lengthy second consultation period. The 14 day period may be reduced if the application was due to expire or if the application was going to planning committee.
4.23	Time limit for amendments to tree applications should be amended as this is an unacceptable reason for lack of public consultation.	There are no statutory regulations in place which govern consultation practices in respect of tree applications. The Council follows good practice set out in the TPOs: A Guide to the Law and Good Practice published by the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister.
Appendix 6	<b>Sport England</b> Draft SCI is basically sound as it includes Sport England as a non-statutory consultee.	Support welcomed.
General	<b>Bovis Homes</b> Support the general strategy set out in the draft SCI.	Support welcomed.
Appendix 6	<b>Robert Hitchins</b> Robert Hitchins should be included as a non statutory consultee.	Robert Hitchins will be added to the database as an interested body.
4.10	<b>Cotswolds Conservation Board</b> The basis for judging whether an application is significant should be explained.	A proposal is considered to be major if there are 10 or more dwelling houses proposed and require an advertisement to be placed in the newspaper. It is not

Appendix 6	Cotswold Conservation Board should be included as a non statutory consultee.	a statutory requirement to state what constitutes a significant application. The Borough Council has identified certain types of planning application at section 4.10 of the SCI which are considered to be significant and warrant extensive consultation.
1.1	<p><b>Government Office for the South West</b> It will be appropriate at times to include people/groups beyond the Borough boundary. Make this clear.</p>	<p>Agree, amend list of non-statutory consultees</p> <p>Agree. Amend paragraph 1.1</p> <p><u>“The Council would like to hear the views of all the community within Cheltenham and also those outside Cheltenham Borough who are affected by the policies and proposals of the LDF and applications for development within the borough. and in order to achieve this...”</u></p>
1.5	Should read ‘and is an opportunity’.	<p>Agree. Amend paragraph 1.5 to delete an.</p> <p><u>“ and is as an opportunity”</u></p>
2	This section should make reference to and explain both Sustainability Appraisals and the Strategic Environmental Assessment.	<p>Agree. Insert after paragraph 2.1</p> <p><u>In 2001 the European Union legislated for Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) on the assessment of the effects of certain plans and programmes on the environment. The objective of the Directive is to provide a high level of protection of the environment, with a view to promoting sustainable development. The implementation of SEA together with sustainability appraisal (SA) of DPDs and SPDs will play an important function in demonstrating that policies and proposals reflect sustainable development objectives, addressing social, environmental and economic effects of proposals at the outset of their preparation.</u></p>
3.8	Provide examples of accessible locations.	<p>Agree. Amend paragraph 3.20 to include</p> <p><u>“within Cheltenham, at the Municipal Offices and at other locations”</u></p>

		Insert the following text at the end of paragraph 3.20  <u>The Council will hold public exhibitions where appropriate at accessible locations within the Borough, such as supermarkets and municipal buildings and at other locations which attract large numbers of the community.</u>
3.8	Consider the church and other religious groups/organisations.  Young people's organisations such as student unions should try to be reached.	Agree. Amend bullet point list at 3.8 to include religious organisations  Agree. Amend bullet point list at 3.8 to include student unions
3.8	Repeat offer of translation for this and other documents.	Agree. Include the following text at the end of paragraph 3.20  <u>If any of the LDF documents are required in another language or on audio tape, this will be made available.</u>
3.8	Can visually impaired people obtain an audio tape of LDF documents?	Yes. See response to above representation and amendment to paragraph 3.20
3.8	Refer to the internet as another means of engaging hard to reach groups.	Agree. Amend bullet point list to include the internet.
3.10	The Inspector is likely to require information about the planned method of consultation for specific DPDs, for example in what circumstances would the SCI recommend the use of Planning for Real exercises?	The approaches which the Council are likely to use are set out at section 3.8 of the SCI. Accept that Planning for Real exercises would be a useful addition to this list and <b>bullet point list should be amended to include this type of exercise.</b>  The Council may wish to use a variety of these methods according to the individual DPD. The particular type of consultation has not yet been determined for specific DPDs.
3.11	PPS12 should be given its full title.	Agree. Amend text to read <b>Planning Policy Statement 12: Local Development Frameworks.</b>
3.12	These illustrations are not very clear or easy to read. Remove from the document and suffice to say that the consultation must meet requirements in the regulations and PPS12 and readers can refer to those documents if they wish.	Disagree, these diagrams provide a useful picture of the public consultation process to readers.

4	This section could be more clearly presented. Start each of the sections with a brief introduction of the type of planning application.	Agree. Insert at the start of paragraph 4.18  <u>Tree applications are those which relate to works for the management and/or removal of trees for those trees which are protected by Tree preservation orders (TPOs).</u>  Add to the start of paragraph 4.24  <u>TPOs are imposed on trees to provide statutory notification. As a result an application for works is required for those trees protected by TPOs.</u>
4.2	Define what is meant by 'more extensive consultation as appropriate to each case' to give people a clear idea as to whether they will be consulted or not.	This is approached on a case by case basis and it would be inappropriate to set out rigid criteria in such circumstances.
4.4	Not clear what is meant by the use of site notices to supplement letters. Are site notices used for all applications? If not, what are the criteria for deciding? When, where and what is the criteria for site notices being used?	Site notices are not used for all applications. The statutory requirements call for all applications to be consulted upon through the use of neighbour notification or a site notice. It is considered that neighbour notification is more useful as it directly consults those who are likely to be most affected by a planning proposal.  The criteria are set out in the Government Circular 15/92: Publicity for Planning Applications.  Site notices are used for all proposals in conservation areas and proposals involving listed buildings.
4.10/4.13	Consider listing in this section, reference to one or more of the approaches listed in PPS12 companion guide Table 7.3 on p.80.	The approaches which the Council are likely to use are set out at section 3.8 of the SCI.
4.15	Under what circumstances would the 14 day period be reduced? Less than 14 days may be impractical.	This comment relates to amendments to planning applications. Given the eight week deadline for determining the majority of planning applications, it is not always practicable to allow for a lengthy second consultation period. The 14 day period may be reduced if the application was due to expire or if the application was going to planning committee.
4.25	This paragraph refers to TPO appeals being	Agree, this is unclear. Insert text at the



	dealt with in a similar fashion to a planning appeal, but doesn't provide any preceding explanation of the planning appeals system.	end of paragraph 4.25 <u>The appeals procedure is explained at paragraph 4.29.</u>
4.29	Unclear whether this paragraph on appeals refers to general planning or hedgerow appeals.	Agree. Insert text at start of paragraph 4.27 to clarify the position  <u>The following text sets out the procedures adhered to, following the decision made on any type of planning application.</u>
5.3	Is there a contingency in place to ensure implementation of the SCI if PDG is insufficient or even withdrawn?	This SCI has been prepared within the context of existing budgets. PDG will assist the Council in implementing the SCI; however this is not reliant upon this funding mechanism.
5.4	It is unclear what will be monitored. Is it the effectiveness of this consultation on the SCI itself or consultations on planning applications and LDDs? If it is the latter, then to what extent, percentage-wise will be monitored. What would trigger a review of the SCI and how does the Annual Monitoring Report relate to this process?	Agree, clarify text. Amend paragraph 5.4 to include the following  <u>"of the consultation undertaken on LDF documents to assess..."</u>  <u>The SCI will be reviewed if it considered that the consultation methods are insufficient or new practices are implemented. The effectiveness of the SCI will be assessed through the work of the Annual Monitoring Report (AMR)</u>
6.1	Consider a more flexible approach to receiving representations e.g. can members of staff record comments on behalf of those people who are unable to complete the form.	Agree. Insert the following text in paragraph 6.1  <u>"the Council's website. If respondents are unable to complete the form, members of staff will record comments on their behalf."</u>
Appendix 6	<b>Peacock &amp; Smith</b> Peacock & Smith should be included as a non statutory consultee.	<u>Include on the database as an interested body.</u>
Appendix 6	<b>Home Builders Federation</b> Note name change to Home Builders Federation.	<u>Amend document accordingly</u>
3.8	There should not be an over-reliance on local methods of communication which exclude representative bodies. Written consultation should be made at all appropriate stages to ensure the views of developers, landowners, etc are included. Traditional consultation methods should be used.	Agree, it is not the intention that an over-reliance be placed on local methods of communication. This point is re-enforced by changes made to paragraph 1.1. Traditional methods of consultation will still be used.

3	The developer, landowner, businesses within the Borough will be key enablers of the aspirations of the plan. As such, clearer reference should be made to the need to involve these groups in the consultation process.	These key enablers are considered within the context of the community and are included as interested bodies.
Appendix 6	<b>F.O.M.B.A.G.</b> Friends of Montpellier Bandstand and Gardens should be included as non-statutory consultees.	Add to database as an interested body.
General	<b>National Playing Fields Association</b> The NPFA would like to be involved in the preparation of LDDs. A set of model policies will be circulated shortly which will provide the essence of the NPFA's representations at the preferred options stage. At the submission stage, the NPFA will provide more detailed comments.	Welcome assistance.
3.2	<b>Tetlow King Planning</b> Welcome Council's overarching aim to consult all members of the community.	Welcome support
3.6/7	Support Council's commitment to hard to reach groups.	Welcome support
5.4	Would like to see the SCI reviewed on an annual basis.	The SCI will be reviewed as appropriate, and given the nature of the document, an annual review is not considered to be necessary.
Q.1	<b>University of Gloucestershire</b> Prefer e-mail.	The Council are happy to use e-mail to those who request this is their preferred contact option.
Q.2	Need to distinguish between hard to reach and hard to obtain responses from. Clarify socially excluded groups.	Agree. Insert text to in paragraph 3.6  "consultation exercises carried out. <u>Also incorporated within the hard to reach groups, are sectors of the community from which it has proven to be hard to get a response from. Reasons for the lack of response from or access to these groups this may be due to...</u> "  Socially excluded groups may be socially excluded for a number of reasons, and it is not considered to be practical or helpful to list them in the SCI.

Q.3	Direct face to face contact at group's home locations, e.g. community centres, youth clubs. Use intermediaries. Make the consultation an educational project. Use theatre groups to dramatise the situations.	Agree that it is appropriate to visit group's meeting places and the use of intermediaries may be appropriate in some cases. Do not consider dramatisation would be appropriate to convey the often complex message of the LDF.
Q.4	Use mobile phone text messages.	Disagree, mobile phone text messages will not be used as a means of communication as systems are not in place to carry out this type of contact.
Q.5	Go to groups rather than wait for them to approach the Council.	Agree. The Council does approach key stakeholders and community groups, rather than wait for them to approach the Council
Q.6	Email.	Agree, the use of e-mail is considered to be a useful mechanism through which to contact the community. <b>Include e-mail in bullet point listing following paragraph 3.8.</b>
Q.7	Direct face to face contact at group's home locations, e.g. community centres, youth clubs. Use intermediaries. Make the consultation an educational project. Use theatre groups to dramatise the situations.	Agree that it is appropriate to visit group's meeting places and the use of intermediaries may be appropriate in some cases. Do not consider dramatisation would be appropriate to convey the often complex message of the LDF.
Q.8	Try to engage intermediaries to do some of the work on the Council's behalf.	Agree that it would be useful to use intermediaries in some cases.
Appendix 6	The list of non-statutory consultees does not appear to have many educational or learning providers listed.	The list of non-statutory consultees are those which the Council is aware of and those who have previously made representations to planning documents or requested to be kept informed on such matters. Interested bodies have not been included in the appendix.
4.5	<b>Dr Peter Christensen</b> There appears to be conflict between using the Echo for communication purposes and the acceptance that sometimes this may be subject to editorial considerations. If this infers that articles may not be published, this is unsatisfactory.	Cheltenham Borough council also place statutory notices in the paper which are not subject to editorial change. Press releases are distributed widely to the local media in Gloucestershire, it is not within the control of the Council which articles are published
Appendix 6	Pleased to note that the CHA is listed in the non-statutory consultees. Presume this is in the context of PPG12. Is PPS12 different to	PPS12 is different to PPG12. For further information, please refer to the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister

	PPG12?	website. <a href="http://www.odpm.gov.uk">www.odpm.gov.uk</a> . Planning Policy Statement 12: Local Development Frameworks sets out the Government's policy on the preparation of local development documents, which will comprise the local development framework.
General	<p><b>Gordon Hill</b> Questions the expense and time involved in producing the SCI.</p>	The production of a SCI is a statutory requirement and as such all local planning authorities will need to publish such a document. The time involved is governed to an extent by the consultation periods involved. The cost of producing the actual document is kept to a minimum.
Appendix 6	<p><b>White Young Green Planning</b> White Young Green should be included as a non statutory consultee.</p>	Include in the database as an interested body.
4.1/8	<p><b>John Heywood</b> Planning applications are only available from the Municipal Offices during office hours and the libraries do not hold applications. This makes it very difficult for people working to access these documents. Consider evening and weekend inspection and deposit documents at the libraries.</p>	Agree, this is unsatisfactory. The Council has approached Cheltenham Reference Library with the aim of depositing all live planning applications submitted within the borough. At the present time, no formal agreement has been reached.
Appendix 6	<p><b>Mr Barry Simon</b> Swindon Village Society should be included as a non statutory consultee.</p>	Agree, amend list of non-statutory consultees
3.7	<p><b>Mr John Mallows Cycle Cheltenham Campaign</b> It is not obvious why the groups listed are hard to reach groups? People who are busy with work/families may also be hard to reach and should be included. The issue is whether people are hard to engage rather than hard to reach. Older people are overrepresented on many committees.</p>	Agree. Insert text to in paragraph 3.6  “consultation exercises carried out. <b>Also incorporated within the <u>hard to reach groups, are sectors of the community from which it has proven to be hard to get a response from. Reasons for the lack of response from or access to these groups this may be due to...</u></b> ”
2.1	Would be helpful to have definition, content, scope and purpose of these documents and possible outlines in order to assess whether comments need to be made in respect of paragraphs 3.14 and 3.15.	The definition, content, scope and purposes of the documents listed can be found in the Cheltenham Borough Local Development Scheme published May 2005. Accept that a cross reference would be useful.  Insert text at the end of paragraph 2.4

		<p><a href="#"><u>The Government Office for the South West approved Cheltenham's Local Development Scheme (LDS) in May 2005. The LDS sets out the documents that will need to be prepared to address the long term needs of Cheltenham. It also provides explanation of the definition and purpose of each of the LDF documents.</u></a></p>
3.14/3.15	<p>The Cycle Cheltenham Campaign only tends to be consulted if the development is directly associated with transport. If it is a major application, the developers believe that they have all the necessary expertise. The SCI and LDF documents need to ensure that consultation is not adversely restrictive and that indirect but valid interests are addressed.</p>	<p>The Cheltenham Cycle Campaign can be added to the weekly distribution list which sets out all planning applications received by the Council if this would be useful?</p>
Appendix 6	<p><b>Gloucestershire Geoconservation Trust</b> Include the Gloucestershire Geoconservation Trust in the list of non-statutory consultees.</p>	<p>Agree, amend list of non-statutory consultees</p>
3.9-3.18	<p><b>Strategic Planning and Regional Planning Gloucestershire County Council</b> The SCI should provide more detail on how the principles of community involvement apply to different types of LDDs as stated in PPS12 and more detail on how the Council will involve people in the process.</p>	<p>The approaches which the Council are likely to use are set out at section 3.8 of the SCI.</p> <p>The Council may wish to use a variety of these methods according to the individual DPD. The particular type of consultation has not yet been determined for specific DPDs.</p>
3.7	<p>The business community have proved hard to engage in the strategic planning process in the past and I question whether the Council has also found this, and if so whether they should be included in the list in 3.7.</p>	<p>Agree. Add the business community to the bullet point list at paragraph 3.8</p>
3.19	<p>I suggest a cross reference in this paragraph to the techniques outlined in 3.8 as these methods are of general benefit as well as being useful for engaging hard to reach groups.</p>	<p>Agree, this would be helpful. Insert text at paragraph 3.19 to read</p> <p><a href="#"><u>“Council’s website together. Refer to paragraph 3.8 of this document for further ways in which the Council will raise awareness of consultation periods.”</u></a></p>
3.8	<p>The Council may wish to consider the use of citizen’s panel for raising awareness/obtaining views by post and for recruiting for discussion groups.</p>	<p>Agree. Citizen’s panels are a useful tool for obtaining views. Add to the bullet point list at paragraph 3.8 the Cheltenham viewpoint</p>

Appendix 6	<p><b>Strategic Rail Authority</b> The SRA can provide guidance and policy advice in the preparation of LDDs.</p>	<p><b>'Viewpointonethousand'</b>. Welcome assistance.</p>
4.17	<p><b>Mr and Mrs Millington</b> Telecoms development should not have permitted development rights and should be subject to full planning applications, given health considerations.</p>	<p>All telecommunications development is subject to development control. However relatively minor development does not require express permission as it is granted planning permission under the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995, as amended. This is a statutory position which the Council cannot amend.</p>
3.19	<p>A six-week consultation period is insufficient, especially for more complex development plan documents. A 12 week period of consultation would be more appropriate.</p>	<p>Disagree. 6 weeks is considered sufficient and is a statutory requirement. Engaging the community early in the process, including setting out clearly when consultation periods will take place will overcome this concern.</p>
Q.1	<p>The Council could consider delivering a letter of notification/information to every household in the same manner as advertisers.</p>	<p>Whilst this is recognised to be a useful tool in reaching the majority of Cheltenham Borough residents, the cost implications are significant and would preclude such extensive advertising taking place. The Council has limited resources and these need to be utilised in the most efficient way.</p>
General	<p><b>Cheltenham Friends of the Earth</b> We are extremely disappointed by the SCI. It seems to have failed to understand the fundamental difference between involvement and consultation. It seems that after the first paragraph the word involvement is replaced with consultation.</p> <p>The result of this change from involvement to consultation is a very old fashioned process in which:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* The LPA writes a policy</li> <li>* People Object</li> <li>* And so on as the adversarial process continues! That is of course for the minority of people who are able to make use of the formal consultation and representation processes and there are a myriad of barriers which, unintentionally, exclude many people.</li> </ul> <p>This was clearly not the Government's</p>	<p>Disagree, good practice guidance on SCIs advises against producing overly prescriptive documents. The SCI sets out how the Council will engage the community through a variety of means. Individual development plan documents and local development documents will require different means of involving the community. The methods listed at paragraph 3.8 may not prove to be as successful as others in different circumstances and will need to be adapted to the particular local development document being developed. As the Council moves through the process, effective means of involving the community will be strengthened, through the monitoring of participation.</p> <p>Some of the hard to reach groups listed</p>

<p>General</p>	<p>intention, nor do we believe the Council’s corporate intention. Nor of course is it in the interests of the community which CBC serves – either in terms of the outcomes or the inefficiencies of adversarial process.</p> <p>We get a sense from the document that CBC wants to do more than the statutory minimum and we commend this, but it is not clear. Where the SCI goes beyond the legal minimum it starts to become very vague about the kinds of things that may be done if appropriate.</p> <p>We do not understand the question at the top of this cell and it is certainly not plain English. What is meant by “grounds”? We assume the question is asking what it is we want to say and that is how we are responding to this on each submission we make.</p> <p>We do not find the response form easy to use and to print it out is extremely costly in ink because of the large black box on page 1.</p> <p>However, we do not, and commend, the fact that we are only “requested” to use this form and would suggest that response forms for the purposes of the LDF are tested by potential respondents before having to be used. With a remit to reach hard to reach groups we would suggest that this fails that test.</p> <p>If you are going to use electronic forms then the boxes need to be formatted as text boxes not auto shapes in order that text can be added in.</p>	<p>will require targeting through different means, and it may be the case that some methods are used and discounted if it is felt that they are ineffective.</p> <p>The representation process is being simplified through the SCI and a more flexible approach is being adopted to receiving comments.</p> <p>This representation refers to Appendix One. The Council does accept representations in any form. Paragraph 3.21 advises that representations may also be made by fax, e-mail or post. Insert the following text in paragraph 6.1</p> <p><u>“the Council’s website. If respondents are unable to complete the form, members of staff will record comments on their behalf.”</u></p> <p>Accept that the black box can exacerbate printing costs and will amend this.</p> <p>Amend electronic forms to be formatted as text boxes.</p>
<p>Omission</p>	<p>Acronyms should not be used. In order to make a document more readable it is important that the text flows and is easy to follow. To keep having to stop to think what this acronym or that refers to is not helpful and should not happen. Every time LDF or DPD or SPD or any other set of initials is used it should be written in full – this would be more akin to plain English.</p>	<p>Disagree, a full summary of terms, including acronyms is provided at appendix 4. Using the full version of each term would result in a much weightier document.</p>
<p>2.1</p>	<p>Our members feel that this paragraph is “as clear as mud”. We think it would prevent people from reading any further because it is almost impossible to understand by people like ourselves who are used to reading such documents – in terms of accessibility it simply fails the test.</p>	<p>Appreciate that the new planning system is complex and uses unfamiliar terminology. Amend the paragraph to provide further explanation to read as follows.</p> <p>“The LDF will be comprised <del>comprised</del> <u>made up</u> of a <del>suite</del> <u>set</u> of documents, called Local Development Documents (LDDs) which</p>

		<p>will include;</p> <p><u>Development Plan Documents</u>  <u>These will set out the Council's planning policies and proposals.</u></p> <p><u>Supplementary Planning Documents</u>  <u>These will provide additional information relating to a specific plan or proposal in a Development Plan Document.</u></p> <p><u>Local Development Scheme</u>  <u>This is a three year plan which illustrates local development documents which will be produced and a timetable for their production. The LDS was made publicly available on 24 May 2005 following approval by the Government Office for the South West.</u></p> <p><u>Statement of Community Involvement</u>  <u>This sets out how the Council will engage and involve the community at every stage in the production of the Local Development Framework.</u></p> <p><u>Annual Monitoring Report</u>  <u>This will monitor the success of development plan document policies and demonstrate how the council is performing in terms of the Local Development Framework.</u></p>
3.4	<p>What is the core strategy referred to here? Where and when will we be advised of the Local Development Scheme referred to? Surely it should form part of this consultation?</p>	<p>The Core Strategy and other LDF documents are explained fully in the Cheltenham Local Development Scheme. The LDS was made publicly available on 24 May 2005 following approval by the Government Office for the South West. It is not subject to the Statement of Community Involvement procedure. E-mails and notification letters have been sent out to advise interested bodies of its availability. It is available electronically via the Council's website, at all libraries and at the Municipal Offices.</p>
3.5	<p>The Council's consultation strategy and consultation toolkit referred to should have accompanied the draft Statement of Community Involvement.</p>	<p>The two documents referred to are available on the Council's website.</p>



3.7/Q.2	Include in the list “people with low literacy skills”	Agree, The Council endeavour to write documents using plain English and avoiding jargon wherever possible. <b>Include those with lower than average literacy skills in hard to reach groups.</b>
Appendix 5	There needs to be a diagram of the relationships between the different Local Development Framework documents and whether there is a hierarchy. The diagram also needs to illustrate how this relates to the Regional Spatial Strategy and other planning documents. There is a diagram at the back in Appendix 5 which if it provided any clarity would be better placed in the text outlining the Framework and how it works	The SCI is not the appropriate document in which to do this. The Local Development Scheme is better placed to illustrate this.
3.8	The Statement of Community Involvement is a statutory document which should set out what the LPA will do to involve the community in the planning process. In some parts the SCI is very detailed, for example on development control aspects, but on the LDF the SCI makes vague statements about the range of techniques that may be beneficial. How can an inspector in considering the soundness of the LDF make a proper assessment of the actual consultation versus the SCI when such vague statements are involved? It would seem reasonable, given that CBC has apparently had a consultation strategy for 12 months and has a long history of consultation that the SCI should be very specific about the consultation arrangements. The SCI should set out a minimum standard that the LPA can be judged against.	Disagree, good practice guidance on SCIs advises against producing overly prescriptive documents. The SCI sets out how the Council will engage the community through a variety of means. Individual development plan documents and local development documents will require different means of involving the community.  By undertaking whatever consultation is appropriate over and above that of the minimum regulations, is not considered to undermine the role of the SCI.  Consultation methods set out in relation to development control are controlled by the regulations set out in Circular 15/92: Publicity for Planning Applications. Elements of the type of consultation which is carried out in respect of certain planning applications, e.g. major and minor development is left to the planning authority to determine.
3.8	The final bullet refers to plain English. This document is not in plain English, but should be.	The document will not be verified by the Plain English campaign. In order to achieve the Plain English stamp, all recommendations to a document have to be accepted, and much of the terminology in the planning reforms and consequently the SCI would not be permitted. The Council endeavour to write documents using plain English and avoiding jargon wherever possible.

Q.1	<p>We wish to see, in accordance with the ideals expressed in paragraphs 1.5 and 2.5:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Meetings to discuss issues prior to the drafting of DPDs and SPDs – and these need to be approached using participative community involvement techniques.</li> <li>- Written hard copy consultation supported by the internet</li> </ul>	<p>Agree, this would be useful. Though prior to the drafting of DPDs and SPDs, the method of engagement may not always be through formal meetings. Other types of involvement may be more appropriate.</p> <p>Every effort is made to ensure Council documents are placed on the internet.</p>
3.14	<p>We refer to previous comments made about the SCI specifying the minimum service we can expect.</p> <p>Whilst we agree with the need to undertake bespoke consultation. This paragraph essentially gives the LPA a free hand to undertake whatever consultation it feels to be appropriate – in effect undermining the whole role of the SCI as a statutory document.</p> <p>Add to this paragraph. “Formulation of this consultation plan for each Local Development Document will involve participative consultation with representative bodies and the communities that may be affected.</p>	<p>Disagree, good practice guidance on SCIs advises against producing overly prescriptive documents. The SCI sets out how the Council will engage the community through a variety of means. Individual development plan documents and local development documents will require different means of involving the community.</p> <p>By undertaking whatever consultation is appropriate over and above that of the minimum regulations, this is not considered to undermine the role of the SCI.</p>
3.15	<p>The paragraph is too vague. The final sentence of the paragraph should specify these stakeholders and the reference to “regularly work with” should be deleted since this excludes most of the community and voluntary sector groups who do not work with the council.</p>	<p>Disagree, the paragraph reflects the lengths people are prepared to pursue comments through the process. Some people may choose to only be involved at an early stage in shaping policies, whereas others may wish to see specific policy wording and maintain objections through to a formal inquiry procedure.</p> <p>It would be impractical to list every stakeholder in this document. The Council has developed links with many community groups, interested bodies, businesses and other organisations and the phrase ‘regularly work with’ reflects the close relationships the Council has with the community.</p>
3.18	<p>No reference has been made to consultation on the scoping report of an SEA/SA and this should be included, extending it from the statutory consultees to a broad range of stakeholders.</p>	<p>Agree. Insert after paragraph 2.1</p> <p><u><a href="#">In 2001 the European Union legislated for Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) on the assessment of the effects of certain plans and programmes on the environment. The objective of the</a></u></p>

<p>3.19</p>	<p>Many voluntary and community groups need more than 6 weeks to formulate effective response. Groups may only meet monthly at best and this leaves an impossible timetable for groups to make considered representative responses. A 6 week period is less likely to facilitate fully participative consultation.</p> <p>We would like to see a 3 calendar month public consultation to ensure that meetings can be held; groups can get together and provide a quality, representative, response. [This would allow groups to have sufficient meeting time to advise fellow members of the consultation and ensure that members had access to copies, full discussion and time for preparation of responses and then the group could approve their response. You cannot expect each time we are consulted on something that we will write to all our members and convene a separate meeting.] It is important that the LPA gives as much notice as possible of consultation periods so that groups can gear up to respond. We also ask that at least 4 weeks prior to the consultation period (when it is likely that internal approvals are already complete and publication date set) the LPA contact all consultees and the media informing them of the forthcoming consultation period. This allows groups to for example nominate members to review the document and to schedule it onto meeting agendas etc.</p>	<p><u>Directive is to provide a high level of protection of the environment, with a view to promoting sustainable development. The implementation of SEA together with sustainability appraisal (SA) of DPDs and SPDs will play an important function in demonstrating that policies and proposals reflect sustainable development objectives, appeasing social, environmental and economic effects of proposals at the outset of their preparation.</u></p> <p>Disagree. 6 weeks is considered sufficient and is a statutory requirement. Engaging the community early in the process, including setting out clearly when consultation periods will take place will address this concern.</p> <p>Contacting consultees to inform them of forthcoming consultation periods will also be a useful mechanism through which to ensure sufficient responses can be made. The Local Development Scheme (LDS) approved by GOSW sets out a timetable for the next three years detailing the preparation schedules for the LDS documents.</p> <p>The aim of the legislation is to speed up the process.</p>
<p>3.20</p>	<p>The vagueness of the SCI undermines its value. The paragraph refers to possible charges for some documents.</p> <p>The SCI should specify that all documents will be available free of charge upon request. This is an inclusive policy since the hard to</p>	<p>The price of documents reflects printing costs which are determined individually by their size. The Council does try to make documents available free of charge, but this is not always possible. Council documents are made available at a variety of locations and also on the</p>

	reach groups are least likely to be able or willing to buy documents.	internet for inspection to assist with this concern.
3.21	The prescription of the format of representations is excessive. The paragraph states that only representations on the form will be accepted. This is unduly prescriptive and the LPA should accept representations in any written form.	The Council does accept representations in any form. Paragraph 3.21 advises that representations may also be made by fax, e-mail or post.
Omission	The deadline for response to the SCI is 5pm on a Friday. That the deadline be changed to 11.00 am on a Monday – whatever the response timescale. This in effect gives community sector organisations or individuals an extra weekend to respond – this is of course when most of this activity takes place – and would allow for hand/postal delivery without affecting the LPA's timetable. We note that the SCI was placed for consultation on Monday 4 April to Friday 20 May 2005 – which is not as long as 6 weeks.	Insert the following text in paragraph 6.1  <u>“the Council’s website. If respondents are unable to complete the form, members of staff will record comments on their behalf.”</u>
4.2	The SCI fails to give the criteria on which the decision of appropriateness is made	Disagree, by running consultation periods which start on a Monday and close on a Friday already allows some additional time for comments to be made.  Monday 4 April to Friday 20 May 2005 is in excess of 6 weeks.  Accepting the representation made would have made the deadline Monday 16 <sup>th</sup> May at 11am.
4.4/4.5	Clarity. The text refers to “major applications” whilst paragraph 4.10 refers to “significant”	This will be judged on a case by case basis.  A proposal is considered to be major if there are 10 or more dwelling houses proposed and require an advertisement to be placed in the newspaper. It is not a statutory requirement to state what constitutes a significant application. The Borough Council has identified certain types of planning application at section 4.10 of the SCI which are considered to be significant and warrant extensive consultation.
4.12	Clarity – it is not clear whether this refers to meetings organised by the applicant or by the LPA. If the latter officers should do more than provide information, but should facilitate.	This refers to meetings undertaken by the applicant. There is a greater emphasis placed upon developers to undertake early community consultation. The Council largely has a watching brief in this role to ensure transparency in decision-making.
4.14	The charge should be specified – small is too vague a word Furthermore copies of applications should be	The price of documents reflects printing costs which are determined individually by their size.

	available free of charge.	
4.15	All procedures, including this amended plans procedure, should form part of the SCI.	This comment relates to amendments to planning applications. Given the eight week deadline for determining the majority of planning applications, it is not always practicable to allow for a lengthy second consultation period. The 14 day period may be reduced if the application was due to expire or if the application was going to planning committee.
4.14	Addition of the following: “The LPA will make one set of application documents available on request for loan to community groups. For significant/major applications at least one copy of the application will be deposited in the Central Library to enable out of office hours access to the documents.”	Agree, this is unsatisfactory. The Council has approached Cheltenham Reference Library with the aim of depositing all live planning applications submitted within the borough. At the present time, no formal agreement has been reached.
4.16	It is unreasonable to restrict public input to the planning committee in such a drastic fashion. It is likely that in all but the most controversial applications the provisions will not be used, but making this provision is important to give the community the sense that they have been listened to. The SCI should allow for five 3 minute slots per side.	The current system in place has proved to be a successful means of allowing parties to speak both for and against development proposals. Five sets of three minute slots per side would result in a potential half hour period of public speaking time for each application at a planning committee. This would be impractical and create serious delay.  All written comments will be considered by the officer when writing the planning committee report which allows a great deal of public input.
Q.8	The aim of the planning process is to involve the community not simply consult it. Effective involvement at the early stages of policy development will reduce the level of confrontation and the huge costs involved in for example Public Inquiries. The question should therefore go back a step and ask perhaps of the LPA how we can <u>involve</u> people in the most cost effective manner, taking into account the costs of not involving them at the right stage!	Agree, it is considered that the front loading system of the new planning system will address this issue. The question sought to capture specific co-effective methods which the Council could use.
Omission	The SCI does not refer to the publication of Section 106 agreements. The SCI should include provisions for the publication of Section 106 agreements prior to the granting of planning approval. These agreements form	If a Section 106 agreement is submitted with a planning application, it is a public document and can be inspected along with the application.

	<p>an important part of the application and approval process.</p> <p>We ask that the SCI states that the terms of S106 agreements and be published with the planning committee papers.</p>	<p>Planning applications are not published with committee papers. Planning applications and Section 106 agreements are cross referred to in officer reports as background papers. Including all applications and other background papers would result in unreasonably large documents.</p>
Omission	<p>The SCI does not refer to the availability of planning committee papers. Reference should be included, to the effect that copies of planning committee papers will be available at least 5 working days prior to the committee on the internet and in the Council offices free of charge. Other local planning authorities already do this.</p>	<p>Agree, this is common practice. Add to start of paragraph 4.16</p> <p><u><a href="#">Planning Committee papers are available five working days before planning committee at the Council offices and on the internet.</a></u></p>
Omission	<p>The right to speak to the planning committee when it is considering LDDs has been omitted. Provisions should be made, to allow up to 5 speakers on each side to speak for a maximum of 5 minutes.</p>	<p>Planning committee does not consider LDDs. They will be subject to either Cabinet or Council meetings. Opportunity for open debate will be made via consultation exercises. All Councillors will be encouraged to enter into debate with the community.</p>
Omission	<p>The LPA should offer roundtable discussions with objectors and facilitate mediation between applicants and objectors.</p>	<p>There is insufficient time to arrange such meetings in the period given to determine planning applications. Council officers dealing with applications will assess objections made in respect of planning proposals and put reasonable points to the developer where appropriate.</p>
Omission	<p>There is not a strategy for reaching young people or other hard to reach groups.</p>	<p>The variety of methods for engaging and involving the public are set out in a list at paragraph 3.8. Linking specific consultation practices to particular hard to reach groups is contained within the Consultation Toolkit.</p>
Omission	<p>It is not clear which parts of the provisions of the SCI are statutory requirements and which are extras propose by the LPA.</p>	<p>It is not considered necessary to distinguish between the statutory requirements and those which the Council undertakes over and above the regulations. The SCI demonstrates a commitment to consult and involve the community.</p>
Omission	<p>At present trees removals that are encompassed within an application for site development such as a new building are not</p>	<p>Disagree that a separate process is required, however new practices have been put into operation.</p>

	<p>consulted upon as “tree applications” so those who would normally be notified of a tree application are not consulted. A mechanism should be introduced to ensure that both the planning application and the tree application consultations processes are followed where such a proposal – such as a planning application with tree removal – is received.</p> <p>A mechanism should be introduced to ensure that both the planning application and the tree application consultations processes are followed where such a proposal – such as a planning application with tree removal – is received.</p>	<p>The Cheltenham Tree Group and other interested parties are advised of all applications involving works to trees.</p> <p>Insert the following text at the end of paragraph 4.18.</p> <p><u>The Council will consult the Cheltenham Tree Group and the Cheltenham Civic Society on any planning application which the Council's Senior Tree Officer is consulted on. This will include planning applications where it is identified that a TPO is present and any application where it is declared that trees are to be removed.</u></p>
5.4	<p>There are mechanisms for reviewing the statement of community involvement are given, rendering it unsound. Monitoring and review process for the SCI.</p>	<p>It is unclear what is meant by this objection. There will be appropriate cases where the SCI will need to be reviewed. For example, to take account of new consultation techniques, or to delete references to methods of engagement which have proven to be unsatisfactory. Any review will be subject to consultation.</p>
Appendix 6	<p>Add Cheltenham Tree Group to list of consultees</p>	<p><b>Agree. Amend list of non-statutory consultees.</b></p>
4.19	<p>Cheltenham is always being promoted as a town of trees yet the consultation on trees is less broad than that for other applications. There should be notification in the press as with planning applications. There should be notification in the press as with planning applications.</p>	<p>Disagree. Not even all planning applications are listed in the newspaper advertisements. To list all tree applications would present a serious cost implication. The Cheltenham Tree Group and other interested parties are advised of all applications involving works to trees.</p> <p>Insert the following text at the end of paragraph 4.18.</p> <p><u>The Council will consult the Cheltenham Tree Group and the Cheltenham Civic Society on any planning application which the Council's Senior Tree Officer is consulted on. This will include planning applications where it is identified that a TPO is present and any application where it is declared that trees are to be removed.</u></p>
4.26	<p>Hedgerow removal applications, whether a rare occurrence or otherwise should be</p>	<p>Please refer to response to representation 4.19.</p>

	publicised in the same way as planning applications and just as widely. In particular the same consultees as for tree applications – e.g. Cheltenham Tree Group and Cheltenham Civic Society should be contacted. In addition, hedgerows provide an extremely valuable habitat for a wide range of wildlife and wildflowers and the Gloucestershire Wildlife Trust should be consulted.	The Gloucestershire Wildlife Trust receive a copy of the weekly list which includes all planning applications received by the Council.
Appendix 6	Friends of the Earth is a national body and they are not consulted. Cheltenham Friends of the Earth is the local group and must be consulted. The list of consultees needs to be amended accordingly.	Agree. Amend list of non-statutory consultees.
Omission	List of consultees should include not only Network Rail and Stagecoach West but the other bus companies operating services in Cheltenham, the Railway Station operator (currently Wessex Trains we believe); National Express.	Agree. Amend list of non-statutory consultees.