

Vale of White Horse District Council

Statement of Consultation

Draft Revised Statement of Community Involvement

Development Policy
Vale of White Horse District Council
The Abbey House
Abingdon
OX14 3JE
www.whitehorsedc.gov.uk

Telephone 01235 520202 extensions 511 or 586

May 2009

Vale of White Horse District Council
Statement of Consultation
Draft Revised Statement of Community Involvement
May 2009

How the Council has already consulted local community groups

In September 2008 the Council sought views from many different organisations representing a range of concerns, interests and areas of the Vale on the consultation arrangements for the LDF and planning applications.

The Council sent out a letter to over 750 organisations and stakeholders based on the consultation bodies specified in PPS12 relevant to the Vale in Appendix 1 of the SCI and other relevant organisations in Appendix 2 of the SCI. The letter (Appendix A) outlined the reasons for the Council reviewing its Statement of Community Involvement and asked for comments on the consultation arrangements for the Local Development Framework and the development control process.

How the consultation response has been used

We received a total of 30 representations. Most of the representations asked the Council to update the contact details of the representees on the Council's database. As a result the consultee database has been updated to take account of these representations. The database will be used to keep individuals and organisations informed of the progress with the Local Development Framework and provide the basis for consultation and feedback on the individual local development documents.

The following substantive comments were made and these are included in Appendix B:

- **Grove Parish Council:** Asked that notification letters for general planning applications should be sent to not just those people that adjoin the application site. They also asked that the SCI and neighbour notification letters should state that plans can be viewed at parish and town council offices.

Council's response: The Council consults the occupiers of all properties that adjoin an application site, but the SCI states at paragraph 6.3 that letters will be sent out more widely for larger development proposals, the extent depending on the scale of the proposal.

Paragraph 6.3 bullet point 4 of the SCI and the Council's information leaflet 'Planning Applications The Rights of Neighbouring and Nearby Residents' that goes out with the neighbour notification letter states 'If

you do not find it convenient to inspect an application at the Council's Offices it may be possible for you, by prior arrangement with your Town or Parish Clerk, to see their copy'.

The comments of Grove Parish Council do not therefore require any changes to the SCI.

- **The Highways Agency:** Asked whether the revised SCI will set out how the Vale will comply with paragraphs 4.27 and 4.28 of PPS12 which relate to engagement with delivery stakeholders such as the Highways Agency.
Council's response: The SCI has been changed in response to this comment to set out the new arrangements for all engagement but particularly key stakeholders.
- **DPDS Consulting:** Would encourage a flexible approach to pre-application consultation. They consider that consultation with neighbours can become more simply than organising exhibition or public meetings. They consider it would be useful if the SCI could set out the delegation agreement in more detail and put the Officers Report for delegated items on the public access system.
Council's response: The SCI as worded allows this flexibility when consulting with neighbours. The delegation agreement is referred to in the SCI for information but has no bearing on how consultation on applications is carried out. It is not considered therefore that the SCI should set out in detail the delegation agreement.
Post decision officer reports are put onto the public access system. Their comments do not require any changes to the (SCI).
- **Keep Harwell Rural Campaign:** Is concerned generally about consultation.
Council's response: Their concern requires no change to the SCI.
- **Oxfordshire County Council:** Commented that they wish to be informed on all stages of the LDF process.
Council's response: The County Council as a key stakeholder is identified as one of the specific consultation bodies. Their comments do not require any changes to the SCI.
- **Hestor Hand:** Found the document long and daunting and could it be summarised.
Council's response: The Council is reviewing the existing document which is of its current length and format so that its consultation procedures can be fully and adequately set out. The points raised do not require any changes to the SCI.

- **D Dew:** Clerk to Stanford in the Vale Parish council raised issues of flooding and lack of infrastructure.
Council's response: These matters do not relate to consultation procedures. Their comments do not require any changes to the SCI.
- **Albert Park Residents Association:** Asked for name change to be noted and worded work to be consulted on any proposed affects the Registered Heritage Albert Park.
Council's response: The Resident's Association is consulted on such matters. Their comments do not require any changes to the SCI.
- **Sunningwell Parish Council:** Concerned that comments of parish council not always taken seriously. Also concerned that local community might not be fully consulted when the proposed new procedure for dealing with major strategic planning applications is operated.
Council's response: The points raised do not require changes to the SCI.
- **Mr Staniland:** Raised issues not related to the SCI.
Council's response: The points raised do not require changes to the SCI.

May 2009

Appendix B