

SCI Submission Version March 2007 Representations and Officer Response

Respondent No	7
Respondent Name	Morrisons Supermarkets
Summary of Repr	No comments to make at this stage but wish to be consulted at future stages of LDF document preparation.
Requested Change	
Officer Response	The comments and the request are noted
Recommendation	
Respondent No	9
Respondent Name	Dursley Town Council
Summary of Repr	The Mayor of Dursley was favourably impressed and in her opinion no changes were necessary. The committee agreed that the production of such an inclusive document should be applauded, both for content and intention, much of which is already in effect.
Requested Change	
Officer Response	The support is welcomed.
Recommendation	

Respondent No	11
Respondent Name	The Theatres Trust
Summary of Repr	We find the document to be sound and look forward to being consulted on further LDF documents.
Requested Change	
Officer Response	The support is welcomed.
Recommendation	

Respondent No	16
Respondent Name	Gloucestershire County Council
Summary of Repr	No further comments to make
Requested Change	
Officer Response	The Comments are noted
Recommendation	

Respondent No	36
Respondent Name	Costwolds Conservation Board
Summary of Repr	The Cotswolds Conservation Board supports the SCI as submitted
Requested Change	
Officer Response	The support is welcomed
Recommendation	

Respondent No	41
Respondent Name	Government Office for the Sou
Summary of Repr	We welcome the changes that have been made.
Requested Change	
Officer Response	The support is welcomed
Recommendation	

Respondent No	51
Respondent Name	Cam Parish Council
Summary of Repr	The Parish Council consider the Submission Version of the SCI to fulfill its aims. One small addition which could help encourage public participation would be to state at Point 12.12 that some Parish and Town Councils also offer public internet access.
Requested Change	
Officer Response	The support is welcomed. The council agrees the reference to some Parish and Town Councils providing public internet access should be included in at paragraph 12.12.
Recommendation	

Respondent No	54
Respondent Name	Painswick Parish Council
Summary of Repre	It is important that people should be aware of planning applications in their area. The only effective way of doing this is by the posting of a white site notice and we consider this should be done for all planning applications. Is there any reason why Parish Councils could not be asked to help out ?
Requested Change	Include Site notices for all applications
Officer Response	<p>The posting of site notices is currently reserved for applications where the ownership of adjoining land is uncertain, or where statute requires. The requirement to post a notice on all applications would necessitate approximately additional two thousand notifications per year, involving increased travelling and officer time. The Authority often has to return to the site to remove them after the consultation period. To do this for these additional applications would once again increase vehicle movements and officer time.</p> <p>The offer of help from the Parish Council is appreciated however, it would be unreasonably to request all parish council clerks/ members to carry out the task of arranging for site notice to be displayed on time and subsequently removed, especially smaller parish councils who may only employ a clerk on a part time or voluntary basis.</p>
Recommendation	
Respondent No	55
Respondent Name	Natural England
Summary of Repre	Only comment is reference to English Nature and Countryside Agency in Appendix 5 be replaced by Natural England.
Requested Change	
Officer Response	It is agreed that these changes should be made to Appendix 5 to provide a factual update.
Recommendation	

Respondent No	58
Respondent Name	Project Stroud
Summary of Repr	Request the inclusion o Project Stroiud in Appendix7
Requested Change	
Officer Response	The Council accepts that Project Stroud be included in Appendix 7
Recommendation	

Respondent No	59
Respondent Name	The Showmen's Guild of Great
Summary of Repr	<p>Councils must take the advice contained within Circular 22/91 into account, both in the preparation of planning policies and in decisions relating to individual planning applications and appeals.</p> <p>In accordance with the advice contained within Circular 22/9, it is respectfully requested that the Council considers the needs of Travelling Showpeople in its emerging Local Development Framework - as there is a shortage of showmen's sites.</p>
Requested Change	
Officer Response	The comments are noted.
Recommendation	

Respondent No	60
Respondent Name	Chalford Parish Council
Summary of Repr	<p>Whilst we understand the document is a legal requirement, we are concerned that this is just another layer of bureaucracy and will cost more money to produce. We do not feel that the document is socially inclusive given the language and jargon and is far too long. Chapter 12 could be used on its own and would be more inclusive especially when you read the box at paragraph 8.2.</p> <p>We would state the following questions and statements:</p> <p>Will Parish Plans and Design Statements be regarded as Supplementary Planning documents?</p> <p>Page 2, in the box, you refer to organisations being involved - who will decide on the organisations?</p> <p>Page 8 – 7.4 needs to demonstrate how you are going to get all sections of the Council working together.</p> <p>Page 8 - 7.5 - We are concerned at the use of consultants from the cost point of view. Is this a wise use of money?</p> <p>Page 14 (c) - We feel that it is insufficient to just notify neighbours who have a common boundary and would recommend that any property that is visually/geographically affected should be notified.</p> <p>Page 16 - 12.15 - Requesting representations to applications to be in writing could restrict people. We would also recommend this includes information about Parish Plans and local plans so people know what they can object to and can make informed decisions.</p> <p>Page 17 - 12.22 We are concerned that the Development Control Committee will only meet monthly - should be more frequently in order to speed up the application process and allow public participation.</p> <p>Appendix 2 is not exclusive; it fails to mention such groups as ex-offenders.</p> <p>This is a document in respect of planning applications and should be more specific towards people who are housebound</p>
Requested Change	
Officer Response	<p>It is noted that Chalford Parish Councils understands that the Council is required to produce a Statement of Community Involvement.</p> <p>Chapter 12 deals only with Development Control, which is just a part of the overall planning process. It is also necessary to explain in the SCI how the community will be engaged in the development of the Council's Local Development Framework. The Council</p>

have tried to keep the explanations of the complexities of LDF process as clear and succinct as possible. However sometimes it is necessary to use terms, which may appear as jargon a brief summary of these terms has been provided at the beginning of the document to prepare the reader. A more comprehensive summary of the terms used is provided in Appendix 4.

The Council has decided to deal with Parish Plans and Village Design Statements as Supplementary Planning Advice. However the status of these documents is not a matter for discussion within the SCI.

The box on Page 2 explains who can become involved. Paragraph 6.4 explains that any group or individuals with an interest can be included. Contact details are provided on the opening page of the SCI

Paragraph 7.4. An explanation of the Council's internal arrangements for inter-departmental working is not considered necessary for inclusion within the SCI.

Page 7.5. The Council considers the use of consultants very carefully, and their use can be cost effective when specialist advice or services is required.

Page 14(c). The remainder of Paragraph 14 does explain that additional neighbour notification will be carried out when it is considered that a development will have an impact over a wider area. To notify visually/geographically affected neighbours, where in planning terms, there is no material impact upon them, would be an unnecessary waste of resources.

Paragraph 12.15. The remainder of the paragraph does explain that if people have reading or writing difficulties special arrangement will be made. This is precisely the object of the whole document, is to explain how and when people may make their representations on the range of planning document that the Council will produce. Community engagement for Parish Plans will not be carried out by the Council but by the community producing the plan.

Paragraph 12.22. The Council has examined the frequency of the monthly Planning Committee Cycle and have found that logistically it would very difficult to service more frequent meetings. In order to speed up the planning process the Council has streamlined the delegated decision making process, described elsewhere in the SCI, leaving only the more controversial applications or those for major development to be considered by the planning committee.

Appendix 2. It is accepted that Appendix 2 is not exclusive and that is why the list is introduced by the statement "Some" of those hard to reach or engage groups are highlighted below. The council is happy to include within its list interested parties any support group or organisation that deals with ex-offenders.

This document is not specifically in respect of planning applications; it deals with public engagement in the whole planning system, administered by Stroud District Council. It is considered that the document demonstrates a willingness to make special arrangements to engage those, such as the housebound, who may find it difficult to use the normal methods listed.

Recommendation	No Change
Respondent No	61
Respondent Name	The Environment Agency
Summary of Repr	Welcome the fact that the Environment Agency is identified as a Statutory Consultee and that we will be consulted at all stages throughout the Local Development Framework process.
Requested Change	
Officer Response	The support is welcomed.
Recommendation	