

Summary of Consultation Responses – Draft Revised Statement of Community Involvement

Consultation 27 February to 9 April 2020

Name/ Organisation/ Comment ID	Comment Summary	Officer Response	Proposed Modification	Agree/ Disagree with Modification and reason why
Response 1	Feels that Vale doesn't have a good record on consultations issues. Disagreed with the 5 District Council Partnership Contract and felt that his response was ignored.	Noted. We receive a high volume of correspondence and therefore we are unable to respond to individual comments.		
Mr Scharf	<p>Advocated for climate change and biodiversity loss to be key considerations likely to be given weight - this change would be for the benefit of both the consultees and prospective applicants/developers.</p> <p>Would like committees to run in a way so that nothing should be said at committee that has not already been said in writing.</p>	<p>The Government's National Planning Policy Framework encourages Councils to take a proactive approach to mitigating and adapting to Climate Change (NPPF, paragraph 149). Policies are already included in the current adopted Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Parts 1 and 2 to mitigate the impact of climate change and the Council will be reviewing this as we prepare a new Local Plan 2041 for the Vale of White Horse. The Council encourages all residents who are concerned about these matters to respond to consultations on these documents.</p> <p>The Council's constitution determines how planning committees are run.</p>		
Response 3	No point in any public consultation when decisions are made outside the democratic process.	The Council read all responses and give them careful consideration.		

Name/ Organisation/ Comment ID	Comment Summary	Officer Response	Proposed Modification	Agree/ Disagree with Modification and reason why
Response 4	SCI process is confusing to people with no planning knowledge. Suggests a short 2 min video to explain how people can get involved.	<p>The SCI is a statutory document that sets out how we will engage with the public on Planning Policy documents and on Planning Applications. There is a glossary at the end of the document which explains the planning terminology used. The council are happy to help answer any questions and can be contacted by telephone on 01235 422600 or email planning@whitehorsedc.gov.uk</p> <p>We will certainly consider the suggested method of a video for future consultations.</p>		
Response 5	Wants residents' opinions to be heard, respected and not ignored. They would like Planners to undertake a mandatory online poll of residents for large schemes. Feels that the method of informing the public of planning applications by laminated notices is outdated and urges for the use of Facebook and internet platforms.	<p>The Council has to consider a number of factors in progressing with policy documents and determining applications. Consultation is a one of the key factors: the Council reads all responses to consultations and gives them careful consideration.</p> <p>It is a legal requirement that a site notice is erected, and thus we will continue to seek to erect site notices where we are statutorily required to do so. This is a process used by other Authorities as standard practice.</p> <p>The Council will consider approaches to engage as best as it can with its communities, including the use of social media, where considered appropriate and in accordance with statutory guidance.</p>		

Name/ Organisation/ Comment ID	Comment Summary	Officer Response	Proposed Modification	Agree/ Disagree with Modification and reason why
Response 6	<p>Thinks that the SCI is too long and doesn't cover what they perceive to be of public interest. This is what they would prefer to know:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1: How to access applications 2: How to respond to applications 3: In simplistic terms, what are grounds for objection, and conversely what would not be deemed appropriate under planning law. <p>As a framework, residents want to know:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1: What applications are VWHDC vs OCC as planning authority. 2: What happens when large applications opposed by residents and regulatory bodies get approved. Who appeals and why does VWHDC allows large developers to take advantage of them with regards to planning conditions, etc. 3: Why large developments (as part of or prior to the local plan) are given approval without supporting infrastructure being in place. Thinks that VWHDC needs social housing instead of affordable housing. 	<p>The Council considers that the SCI appropriately covers how to access applications, how to respond to applications and the grounds for objections. The Council's website also provides further detail on this. If you still have further questions, you may wish to contact our Customer Services Team by telephone (01235 422600) or via email - planning@whitehorsedc.gov.uk</p> <p>We acknowledge these points and we will propose making a modification to the SCI to provide clarity regarding applications for the district and county. Section 27 of the SCI sets out who can appeal a decision on a planning application and provides links to further information. We work with developers and communities throughout the planning process to ensure infrastructure is appropriately implemented. We will consider your social housing point whilst developing our new Local Plan 2041.</p>	Add further sections on what applications are covered by the district and which are covered by the county.	Agreed – suggested change taken forward and added in 12.4 – 12.6.
Mr Smith	Wants the document to be proof-read because of grammar mistakes and inconsistencies. Makes the point that if VWHDC uses results from previous consultations, that they could be out of date and people	The document is in draft form and will be reviewed prior to finalising. The Council will consider the consistency suggestions made.	Further proofreading.	Agreed.

Name/ Organisation/ Comment ID	Comment Summary	Officer Response	Proposed Modification	Agree/ Disagree with Modification and reason why
	<p>may have changed their opinion since. Wants there to be a fixed charge on printed copies of documents, with more explanation regarding the pricing. Wants more opportunities to appeal planning applications. Confused about how Planning Enforcement operates.</p>	<p>The Council encourages customers to get in contact about the pricing of printed documents and provides a standard fee reflecting the size of the document.</p> <p>We are unable to change the planning appeal process as this is set out by national legislation and policy. We will propose expanding the Planning Enforcement section to provide further clarity.</p>	<p>Consider expanding the Planning Enforcement section to provide further clarity.</p>	<p>Suggested change taken forward - Planning Enforcement Section presented in a different format for clarity regarding the processes.</p>
Samuel Pocock	No comment.	Noted.		
Mr Hatzis	No comment.	Noted.		
Response 10	<p>Thinks that public opinion is overruled and ignored in this SCI exercise. Feels that the public is ignored regarding development of areas and wants there to be a committee if an application attracts more than two objections.</p>	<p>We receive a high volume of correspondence and are unable to respond to individual comments that we receive during a particular consultation. The comments we receive regarding planning policy documents and on planning applications will be made publicly available online at the earliest opportunity, once the consultation has finished.</p>		

Name/ Organisation/ Comment ID	Comment Summary	Officer Response	Proposed Modification	Agree/ Disagree with Modification and reason why
		The Council's constitution sets out the process for planning committee, rather than the SCI.		
Mr Lynch	<p>Feels that the document is confusing and contains planning jargon. "Have in place effective mechanisms for documenting views and clear feedback mechanisms to demonstrate how the views of the community have influenced and benefited the plan."</p> <p>In the section 'Recognising the needs of different groups' - there should be a forum for local planning, architectural and development groups that regularly use the service.</p> <p>Argues that VWHDC needs to be more proactive and less passive in collecting the views of local communities.</p> <p>Wants there to be a well-designed focus group to go into the communities.</p> <p>Thinks that the Local Plan puts more emphasis on housing growth without considering its supporting services.</p> <p>Feels the document is too long and isn't inventive.</p>	<p>At the end of the SCI document the Glossary section explains all planning terminology that has been used.</p> <p>Regarding feedback, please see the SCI's 'Providing feedback and sharing information' section. For example, 'we will keep you informed of progress and explain decisions and/or outcomes on planning policy documents through your preferred channel of communication'.</p> <p>The Council provides various options of ways in which the public can get involved in consultations, particularly in Section 9.</p> <p>Regarding planning for new housing, the Government has set out a clear intention within their policies, including the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, see paragraph 59), to 'significantly boost the supply of homes'. This is taken forward by the Council at the local level through the Adopted Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031.</p> <p>The SCI is a statutory document which sets out how we engage with local communities (local</p>		

Name/ Organisation/ Comment ID	Comment Summary	Officer Response	Proposed Modification	Agree/ Disagree with Modification and reason why
		residents, businesses, organisations and statutory consultees). We have, as concisely as possible, provided all the information needed and have used diagrams and other graphical design to make this user-friendly.		
Response 13a	Wants the document to be proofread for graphical issues that are not letting them read the content. Wants multiple pages to be reissued.	The document is in draft form and will be reviewed prior to finalising.	Proofreading	Agreed
Response 14	<p>Wants the Green Belt to be expanded and improved. Wants more green spaces which are easily accessible.</p> <p>Finds the SCI format off-putting, doubts that many people read the document. They didn't finish reading it themselves. Prefers a printed survey to be sent through the post.</p>	<p>The Green Belt is dealt with via Planning Policy, rather than the SCI. The SCI deals with how the LPA will engage with the community.</p> <p>The SCI is split into 3 concise parts which can be read separately. We will consider the format of the document when finalising the SCI. Hard copies of the survey can be requested by contacting our community engagement team. It would be too costly to print a survey for every household within the district - we aim to advertise consultations through online methods and through Town and Parish Councils.</p>		
Mrs Moorley	<p>Proposes that community involvement needs to include vulnerable individuals (e.g. elderly and the young). Concerned that there is too much housing development, and this overwhelms the community, especially the elderly.</p> <p>Concerned that the elderly cannot partake, because of issues with being immobile. Moreover, they feel that if they have written by post they are ignored because</p>	In the SCI Part 1 – in the section 'recognising the need of different groups' we have stated that we endeavour to engage with groups in our community that may find us less accessible (e.g. disability groups and ethnic groups – these are sometimes referred to as 'hard to reach' groups) or those likely to be particularly affected by a proposal. We encourage involvement from groups that have traditionally		

Name/ Organisation/ Comment ID	Comment Summary	Officer Response	Proposed Modification	Agree/ Disagree with Modification and reason why
	<p>they don't receive feedback. Argues that they want individuals to be heard instead of groups, if wanting to consult in the most effective way.</p> <p>Confused and upset about how bus stops are planned. Argues that there aren't any plans for how to accommodate the elderly. Want there to be safer crossings made.</p> <p>The format of the document is clear and well explained. Thinks that the document might be too long for some people.</p>	<p>not been involved in the planning process (for example, holding targeted events with younger people). All consultation responses, whether electronic or postal, are treated with the same consideration.</p> <p>Useful information regarding new bus stops can be found here: https://www.oxfordshire.gov.uk/residents/roads-and-transport/street-maintenance-z/bus-stops-and-shelters - bus stops are the responsibility of Oxfordshire County Council.</p>		
Response 16	<p>The Vale website is difficult to use for the elderly and believes that because of this they should have been given more time to comment on issues. Feels that even though there is good involvement, their opinion on a matter was ignored in the consultation for the drafted Local Plan and finds it a waste of time.</p> <p>Thinks that the SCI doesn't address conflict of interest because they believe that the Vale had a financial interest in a previous matter. Wants the results of consultations to be complied with.</p>	<p>We receive a high volume of correspondence and are unable to respond to individual comments that we receive during a particular consultation. Comment summaries and officer responses to all comments on the SCI will be published alongside the finalised document.</p> <p>The SCI sets out how the Local Planning Authority will engage with the community. The Council reads all responses to consultations and gives them careful consideration.</p>		
Oxfordshire Transport & Access Group	For major applications it would be helpful if there were a separate category for applications for either more than 49 homes or more than 4,999 square metres of gross floor area. Confused what is meant by floor area.	The definition of major applications is in accordance with the government definition set out in the National Planning Policy Framework.	'Floor area' should be updated to floorspace in accordance with	Agree modification – to use up to date NPPF definition.

Name/ Organisation/ Comment ID	Comment Summary	Officer Response	Proposed Modification	Agree/ Disagree with Modification and reason why
	<p>A summary of the decision-making body / personnel for each of the various types of Planning Policy Documents would be helpful.</p> <p>A few general principles should be included. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A proportion of homes must be "affordable", with an indication of the intended proportion; • A proportion of homes must be accessible to disabled people, with an indication of the proportion (this should be higher than the national average). • Highway improvements must improve accessibility; • Community buildings provided must be accessible. 	<p>Floor area relates to the internal floorspace proposed by an application. We will propose a modification of the SCI to clarify this.</p> <p>The Council is the decision-making body for all planning policy documents.</p> <p>National and Local Policy set out the details and principles for planning policy. The SCI sets out how we will engage with the community and is therefore not a document that sets out policy.</p>	NPPF definition of major sites.	Suggested change taken forward.
Highways England	Have reviewed the consultation and have no comments.	Noted.		
Historic England	We support the general aims and approach to the draft Statement of Community Involvement. We welcome the acknowledgement of Historic England as a specific consultation body with respect to local plans at paragraph 10.5 and neighbourhood plans at 10.6, as well as reference to statutory consultees regarding planning applications at paragraph 22.2.	Noted and support welcomed.		
Uffington Parish Council	Clarify role and engagement of individuals as stakeholders vs organised bodies.	Section 22 of the SCI sets out who we will engage and consult with regarding planning		

Name/ Organisation/ Comment ID	Comment Summary	Officer Response	Proposed Modification	Agree/ Disagree with Modification and reason why
	<p>Their experience of creating a neighbourhood plan and its relationship to the Local Plan was good.</p> <p>In the application process additional information from the applicant and/or advice given during Step 5 has not been made public. In order to ensure transparency, this should be made public and the parish council should be given the opportunity to comment.</p>	<p>policy documents and on planning applications, including statutory bodies and members of the public. All comments submitted will be given consideration.</p> <p>Step 5 in Figure 9 states that “if an application is formally amended to address any planning issues raised, we will usually re-consult anyone who responded to the original consultation”. Therefore, the usual process would enable further comments to be submitted.</p>		
Harcourt Hill Campus	<p>Object to the current draft of the Statement of Community Involvement on the basis it does not pay sufficient attention to the University, which is a key part of its local community. In response, the SCI should be amended to specifically recognise Higher Education providers. We have set out the required changes below which would allow the University to change its position and support the SCI. Please note that text in red strikethrough shows where we propose a deletion and blue text shows a proposed insertion.</p> <p>Paragraph 9.5: Make the following changes to the penultimate bullet point: Target work with community groups, voluntary organisations, and businesses and education providers</p> <p>Paragraph 10.2: make the following changes:</p>	<p>We acknowledge these points and are content to take them into account / make the suggested changes.</p>	<p>Add ‘and education providers’ to 9.5 and ‘schools, and colleges and higher education providers; and ‘hard to reach’ groups’ to 10.2.</p>	<p>Agree modification – suggested change taken forward.</p>

Name/ Organisation/ Comment ID	Comment Summary	Officer Response	Proposed Modification	Agree/ Disagree with Modification and reason why
	<p>We continuously look to understand who we need to talk to in the local community to ensure that we consult in the most effective way. The local community includes, but is not limited to, the following: town and parish councils and meetings; local residents; local interest groups; local businesses; local community groups and organisations; faith groups; schools, and colleges and higher education providers; and 'hard to reach' groups.</p>			
Radley Parish Council	<p>Summary of comments</p> <p>i. Paras 11.13 – 11.23 of draft statement. Neighbourhood Development Plans. In exercising the 'duty to support', VWHDC should contribute constructively to the delivery of parish council's planning objectives and not focus solely on process.</p> <p>ii. Paras 11.28 – 11.31. CIL. There is an urgent need for mechanisms to be established to allow for tripartite discussion between district, county and parish about priorities for CIL expenditure.</p> <p>iii. Paras 20.1 – 20.3. Development Forums should be mandatory.</p> <p>iv. Para 22. Consultation on planning applications. Parish councils should be consulted on 'discharge of conditions' applications.</p> <p>v. Paras 25.4 – 25.6. Planning Committee involvement in decisions on planning applications: We have concerns that the role of the planning committee is being eroded. We would like to see a published protocol clarifying the basis on which applications are</p>	<p>Neighbourhood planning provides a powerful set of tools for local people to plan for the types of development to meet their community's needs, where the ambition of the neighbourhood is aligned with the strategic needs and priorities of the wider local area. We provide advice and guidance throughout the process and the Council's Neighbourhood Planning Team can assist in delivering a neighbourhood plan which is in general conformity with the strategic policies of the adopted development plan and addresses the Parish Council's planning objectives.</p> <p>The SCI sets out how the Council will engage with the local community on planning documents and planning applications. For issues with specific Planning Policy areas, comments would need to be made when these documents are consulted upon.</p>		

Name/ Organisation/ Comment ID	Comment Summary	Officer Response	Proposed Modification	Agree/ Disagree with Modification and reason why
	<p>referred to the committee for decision. We also have concerns about how pre-commencement conditions are handled.</p> <p>vi. Paras 26.1 – 26.4. Section 106/planning obligations. Three-way meetings involving the district, county and parish should be incorporated as a recognised part of the pre-application process for strategic site development.</p>	<p>It would not be appropriate to have development forums on all applications and could unnecessarily delay development coming forward. It is therefore not appropriate to make development forums mandatory. Where there is a significant level of public interest on an application the Council will consider the use of a development forum.</p> <p>As para 25.4 states “The criteria for deciding which applications should be considered by Planning Committee are available on our website: www.whitehorsedc.gov.uk/services-andadvice/planning-and-building/planning-committees”.</p> <p>The Council’s constitution sets out the process for planning committee, rather than the SCI.</p> <p>Regarding Discharge of Condition applications, these will generally relate to technical issues and therefore the Council will consult the relevant technical consultee.</p>		
Scottish and Southern Electricity Networks	SEPD is concerned that insufficient discussion has taken place between SEPD and Planning Authorities concerning the future of these lines prior to the granting of planning permission. SEPD believes that in these	The SCI sets out how the Council will engage with the local community and key stakeholders (SEPD are one of these) regarding planning services. Issues relating to specific planning		

Name/ Organisation/ Comment ID	Comment Summary	Officer Response	Proposed Modification	Agree/ Disagree with Modification and reason why
	<p>circumstances, the Planning Authority should impose a condition prohibiting development until such time as the developer has reached agreement with the Distribution Network Operator (DNO) (a) as to how the development can be laid out such that the line(s) can be retained in their current position; or (b) such that contractual arrangements have been agreed to modify the overhead lines.</p>	<p>applications will need to be addressed through engagement on that planning application.</p>		
<p>Marcham Parish Council</p>	<p>1. S26 should provide that draft S106 agreements be sent to the relevant Parish Council for information purposes and invite comment. Currently agreements are finalised between the District Council and the developer/landowner. The Parish Council may be aware of local facts, which could be relevant. Whilst the situation is changing with CIL, the Parish Council at least should have the opportunity to have sight of anything which affects its parish including the draft S106 agreements.</p> <p>2. The Council, too, would request that Parish and Town Councils are notified when applications to discharge conditions are submitted. This would give an opportunity for the Parish Council to view the application, to check that what is proposed falls in line with its initial comments on an application.</p>	<p>Paragraph 26.3 provides appropriate guidance on this, stating that “We do not consult on Section 106 agreements. However, we seek confirmation from towns and parishes on community facilities that the new development may impact upon or require improvement as a result of the development. Once we have an agreement and the development has commenced, we will notify towns and parish councils and meetings of the sums available for identified community facilities and provide an update to them on a six-monthly basis.”</p> <p>Discharge of condition applications generally relate to technical issues; therefore, the LPA will undertake consultation with the relevant technical consultee where necessary.</p>		
<p>Nuclear Regulation</p>	<p>Due to the location of the Harwell nuclear licensed site, ONR requests to be consulted in line with our Land Use Planning processes which are published at</p>	<p>The Office for Nuclear Regulation is a statutory consultee and will be consulted in accordance</p>		

Name/ Organisation/ Comment ID	Comment Summary	Officer Response	Proposed Modification	Agree/ Disagree with Modification and reason why
	http://www.onr.org.uk/land-use-planning.htm for proposed developments within our consultation zones that meet our consultation criteria.	with national policy and ONR guidance, as set out in the SCI.		
Wycombe District Council	No comments to make on the draft SCI.	Noted.		
Oxford City Council	Support the Draft Revised Statement of Community Involvement.	Noted, and support is welcomed.		
Wantage and Grove Campaign Group	<p>-Thank you for combining the previous documents into one – this makes it much clearer.</p> <p>- What does "early involvement with local communities in the preparation of our planning policy documents and in the consideration of planning applications," (Page 5) mean?</p> <p>- How will you "endeavour to engage with a wide range of formal and informal local community groups and voluntary organisations, stakeholders, town and parish councils and parish meetings and other groups in the community that we become aware of" (page 5)?</p> <p>- The document states that you "make our planning documents, background studies and responses to</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>"Early involvement with local communities in the preparation of our planning policy documents and in the consideration of planning applications" is a principle which underpins our Statement of Community Involvement. Specific examples of how the LPA will engage with communities can be found when detailing the approaches to consulting on Planning Policy documents and planning applications. This is also the case for how we will "endeavour to engage with a wide range of formal and informal local community groups and voluntary organisations, stakeholders, town and parish councils and parish meetings and other groups in the community that we become aware of".</p> <p>The Council do not consider it appropriate to place planning documents in Parish Council</p>		

Name/ Organisation/ Comment ID	Comment Summary	Officer Response	Proposed Modification	Agree/ Disagree with Modification and reason why
	<p>consultations...readily available to the public on our website and in some cases on paper at local libraries and at our offices" (page 5 box 5). Why not in parish council offices?</p> <p>- Can you provide a list of "deposit locations" (para 3.3) please?</p> <p>- This link does not exist "Further information on our SPDs can be found online at: http://www.whitehorsedc.gov.uk/spd ." (para 11.8).</p> <p>- The Figures in Section 11 are very clear – thank you.</p> <p>- Many of the strategic decisions which drive the planning policy in the Vale are taken at either OXLEP or the Growth Board, of both of which the District Council are a member – how does the Vale ensure that the local Community are involved in this process and why isn't this included in this document? We understand that the "Assessment of Growth Needs commission" is underway and that there will be no separate consultation on this. Given all the issues for the Vale created by the SHMA since 2014 and the lack of consultation around that, this lack of consultation on the Assessment of Growth Needs seems to be a significant issue.</p>	<p>offices as not all Parish Councils or Parish Meetings will have offices.</p> <p>There is no definitive list of “deposit locations”, though these are typically libraries within the district; where these deposit locations are will depend on the type of document/s being consulted on and where it is appropriate to make copies available.</p> <p>The link will be updated when finalising the SCI.</p> <p>Noted and support welcomed.</p> <p>The SCI sets out how the LPA will engage with the community on planning documents that the district council is responsible for. Issues of other organisations’ governance and engagement methods cannot be addressed by the Council’s SCI.</p> <p>Evidence to support the production of the Oxfordshire Plan 2050 will be commissioned and produced by the Oxfordshire Plan team in consultation with the district and city councils. This plan is required by legislation to go through the same consultation processes as the district’s own Local Plan would. The</p>	<p>Update link to SPD page on Vale website. Para 11.8</p>	<p>Agree modification – to correct link.</p>

Name/ Organisation/ Comment ID	Comment Summary	Officer Response	Proposed Modification	Agree/ Disagree with Modification and reason why
	<p>- During the planning application process, (Figure 9 step 5) the requirement appears to be, that when an application is formally amended to address any planning issues raised, to re-consult anyone who responded to the original consultation. It may be that the amendment changes the application in such a way that an individual who didn't respond to the original consultation may want to. Surely any amendment should be referred to all those who share a boundary with the site, the town or parish council, any relevant specialist consultees and anybody else who might be affected not just those who have already responded.</p> <p>- Any minor application can only be discussed at the Planning Committee if the chairman agrees to the local district councillor's request to call in an application. No mention is made of the obligation of the individual district councillor to call in an application if an individual or the town or parish council requests it. What grounds does the councillor have for refusing to call in an application? Also, what grounds does the chairman of the Planning Committee have for refusing the request?</p> <p>- Para 19.2 states that any pre-application advice letters between the applicant and the council will be disclosed when the application is formally submitted. No mention is made of notes of any discussions held either by telephone or face to face meetings. Surely these should also be disclosed?</p> <p>- Section 20 relates to development forums. We have found the development forums for Crab Hill and Grove Airfield a useful way of providing communication</p>	<p>Oxfordshire Plan team will be responsible for engagement with local communities and have their own Statement of Community Involvement.</p> <p>The usual process when an amendment has been made to an application will be to re-consult those who have already commented. However, the Council has the discretion to consult more widely if it considers the amendment to warrant a greater level of consultation.</p> <p>The Council's constitution addresses matters of process regarding planning committees. This is not addressed by the SCI.</p> <p>The Council consider it appropriate that the pre-application advice given is disclosed when the application is formally submitted.</p> <p>We note your positive experience of development forums, and your proposition of the forums being required for developments of 200 or more. However, we have to balance the interests of all stakeholders and the Council consider that it is appropriate it applies its</p>		

Name/ Organisation/ Comment ID	Comment Summary	Officer Response	Proposed Modification	Agree/ Disagree with Modification and reason why
	<p>channels between the community and the developer. We would suggest that these should be made a formal part of the process for any large development where applications involve more than 200 dwellings or are part of a large scheme of more than 200 dwellings.</p> <p>- Section 22 relates to who is consulted on any application. We have noticed that even though some of the reserved matter applications for major developments will be visible from the AONB, they are not always listed as a consultee. Why is this? Could they be added to the requirements in some way?</p>	<p>discretion when considering which proposals are likely to generate significant public interest and would benefit from a developer forum. Where it is deemed appropriate the council will consult with the AONB board on planning applications which may impact the AONB.</p>		
Fyfield and Tubney Parish Council	<p>Consultation is duly made; it is done so as a formality without substance. Responses to representations are formal, superficial and unsubstantiated; and representations are then ignored.</p> <p>The planning procedure must be flexible.</p> <p>Representations made on behalf of local communities, who best understand the situation on the ground, are essential and must be respected.</p> <p>An effective dialogue between the planners and the community should be established; plans should be modified if necessary.</p> <p>The process of Community Involvement is outlined in the flow chart on page 12 of the Draft Revised Statement of Community Involvement. This should be modified as follows:</p> <p>May we suggest the text in the third box from the top in the diagram on page 12 which reads 'Process representations received' could be modified to read:</p>	<p>The council has to consider a number of factors in progressing with policy documents and determining applications. Consultation is a one of the key factors: the council reads all responses to consultations and gives them careful consideration.</p> <p>The council considers Figure 1 to accurately represent the necessary stages involved in the production of a development plan document.</p>		

Name/ Organisation/ Comment ID	Comment Summary	Officer Response	Proposed Modification	Agree/ Disagree with Modification and reason why
	<p>'Note, respond carefully to and, where appropriate, act upon representations received, and modify the plan accordingly'. Also, the text in the sixth box on page 12 which reads 'Respond to representations received on the published DPD' could be modified to read: 'Note, respond carefully to and, where appropriate, act upon representations received on the published DPD, and modify the plan accordingly'. The process of consultation with the community must be improved and the text of the SCI changed to reflect this.</p>			
Cherwell District Council	<p>Supportive of Section 2 and of the commitments made under the Duty to Co-operate. Supportive of the commitment in paragraph 10.5 to always consult on Planning Policy Documents. Supportive of the commitment to notify Town and Parish Councils of applications adjacent to their boundary but would request clarification that such notification extends to Town and Parish Councils outside of Vale of White Horse administrative area. We would also like to request clarification on whether adjoining Local Planning Authorities would be notified of applications for any strategic scale sites. CDC would wish to be notified of any planning applications for strategic sites in close proximity to their border.</p>	<p>We note the comments and welcome support. Clarifications will be made to the document regarding adjoining LPAs being notified of strategic sites coming forward adjacent to district boundary. We can confirm that the council consults adjoining districts but not adjoining parishes. However, if parishes wish to submit views then they will be considered.</p>	<p>Modify document to provide clarity re adjacent districts being notified of applications that may affect them.</p>	<p>Agree with modification - to provide further clarity. Suggested change taken forward.</p>
Nuclear Decommissioning Authority	<p>Agree with the principles contained within the draft SCI. However, would wish to list the Nuclear Decommissioning Authority ('the NDA') as a Local Stakeholder representing the interests of a business</p>	<p>We note and welcome your support for the principles contained in the SCI.</p>		

Name/ Organisation/ Comment ID	Comment Summary	Officer Response	Proposed Modification	Agree/ Disagree with Modification and reason why
	within the Vale of the White Horse district as part of any upcoming Local Plan consultation opportunities.	We recognise that NDA are a local stakeholder. The interests of local businesses are stated in the SCI as needing to be considered, therefore, we consider that the NDA would fall into this category and is therefore recognised in the SCI.		
CPRE	<p>There is no acknowledgement of the climate emergency.</p> <p>Proposed a change in wording in the introductions as follows; ‘Decisions we make, and policies we set, affect local residents, businesses and organisations now and in the future, so it’s important they are that everyone is involved from the start.’</p> <p>More emphasis should be given on the process by which the feedback is considered and incorporated into the plans.</p> <p>The principles of engagement in paragraph 2.2 must be defined in the context of sustainability and the climate emergency declared by the Vale.</p> <p>Further clarification should be given to what circumstances paper copies will be provided to Parish Councils. Electronic copies should suffice with an obligation on Parish Councils to provide access on request to those without internet access.</p>	<p>The council acknowledges the comments made by CPRE.</p> <p>We will make a modification reflecting these comments, for clarity.</p> <p>Comments received on planning policy documents are reviewed and summarised. An officer response is provided which sets out a response to the comment received. This commitment is set out in paragraph 14.1.</p> <p>Sustainable engagement generally refers to the physical, emotional and social wellbeing of participants, which are not within the SCI’s remit. Sustainability and the climate emergency will be considered in the new Local Plan 2041.</p> <p>There are no set circumstances for when paper copies will be provided. It will be for the LPA to make a judgement as to whether paper</p>	<p>Proposed a change in wording in the introductions as follows; ‘Decisions we make, and policies we set, affect local residents, businesses and organisations now and in the future, so it’s important they are that everyone is involved from the start.’</p>	<p>Agree with majority of modification to provide further clarity.</p> <p>‘Decisions we make, and policies we set, affect local residents, businesses and organisations now and in the future, so it’s important they are that everyone has the opportunity</p>

Name/ Organisation/ Comment ID	Comment Summary	Officer Response	Proposed Modification	Agree/ Disagree with Modification and reason why
	<p>Paragraph 3.5 needs to be expanded to explain the status and role of the database in more detail. If asked to be added to database, it is not clear what will happen and what you will be consulted upon.</p> <p>Paragraph 6.2 should set out the targets for any SCI review.</p> <p>The diagram in paragraph 7.1 is misleading. There is no mention of DPD's, SPD's, the new 2041 plan and it is not clear where the OCC mineral plan fits into equation.</p> <p>There is no chart for the Local Plan process. This implies that the Local Plan is completed, however consultation has started on the Local Plan 2041 with a call for sites. Consultation process for a Local Plan must be defined.</p> <p>In Figure 1, box 3 and box 6, further explanation is required about how the representations will be reviewed, considered and acted upon.</p> <p>The link in paragraph 11.8 does not work.</p>	<p>copies will be required to be distributed depending on the consultation.</p> <p>More information is provided by following the link to sign up, or information is available if you were to call the number provided. We do not consider it appropriate to define all of this information in the SCI.</p> <p>This paragraph states the SCI will be reviewed periodically to take account of changes to legislation, government guidance or local circumstances. The targets of any review would therefore be to take into account any changes in these areas.</p> <p>The Vale of White Horse Development Plan currently consists of Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031, Parts 1 and 2, Oxfordshire County Council Minerals and Waste Plan and made Neighbourhood Plans. SPDs are not part of the Development Plan and therefore not included in the diagram.</p> <p>A Local Plan is a Development Plan Document, and therefore should follow the consultation requirements as set out in Figure 1. This is explained at paragraph 11.4.</p> <p>We will update the link in paragraph 11.8.</p>	<p>Update link to SPD page on</p>	<p>to be involved from the start.'</p> <p>Majority of suggested change taken forward.</p> <p>Agreed – suggested</p>

Name/ Organisation/ Comment ID	Comment Summary	Officer Response	Proposed Modification	Agree/ Disagree with Modification and reason why
	<p>Reference should be given to the climate emergency declared by the Vale in section 11.9: Sustainability Appraisal. There needs to be a commitment to follow equivalent UK legislation post Brexit.</p> <p>There should be an additional step in Figure 5: CIL Preparation to appraise any significant changes to the schedule following consultation.</p> <p>In paragraph 13.6 change may to will.</p> <p>Comments are often summarized or abbreviated (justifiably?) More often than not they are dismissed. Very few comments are accepted leading to changes to the documents, and the overall feeling is that due process might have been followed, but the comments are ignored - the plan is right.</p> <p>In paragraph 14.4, mention is needed of the online process used to collect comments, whereby comments are required section by section, so responses are fragmented, and it is very hard to make an argument that applies to the overall plan, rather than individual sections.</p> <p>Development Forum for Valley Park was a waste of time. Developer was defensive and not prepared to listen, neither were other participants. Just wanted to</p>	<p>This will be addressed by the new Local Plan 2041, rather than the SCI.</p> <p>In regard to Figure 5, a consultation statement is required to be submitted as part of the CIL Examination, and this action would therefore be included in this step.</p> <p>This is a matter of judgement for the LPA, and therefore the wording should remain 'may'.</p> <p>Comments are summarised so that similar issues raised by multiple representations can be appropriately addressed comprehensively, The LPA take all comments into consideration and will make appropriate changes to the documents to reflect the comments received.</p> <p>Comment forms will differ depending on the consultation and in some cases, it is appropriate for the form to be divided. There is also, in most cases, an additional question where any other issues that you feel you may not have addressed already can be raised.</p> <p>We note your view on the Valley Park Development Forum, however there are</p>	<p>Vale website. Para 11.8</p>	<p>change taken forward.</p>

Name/ Organisation/ Comment ID	Comment Summary	Officer Response	Proposed Modification	Agree/ Disagree with Modification and reason why
	<p>say what a bad idea the project was. Not a constructive process.</p> <p>Needs something on how decisions are communicated. For big applications requiring a S106 the committee may be minded to grant permission, but the decision is not implemented until the S106 has been agreed. Meanwhile there is no record of status on the planning database, and you have to wait weeks before the minutes of the planning committee meeting are published. Case in point is Valley Park. P14/V2873/O. Database shows no decision issued. But it went to Planning Committee FOUR years ago. What is going on.</p> <p>The speaking time for major applications should be changed and there should be an opportunity for committee members to question the speakers.</p> <p>The S106 is the one area where the community can see some benefit from a development and where there is almost no scope for engagement and consultation. A sympathetic officer may list parish requests for S106 when reporting to the planning committee. After committee the S106 goes into a black hole (Valley Park S106 has been there for 4 years). When it emerges, and the S106 published and the decisions issued, it is too late to correct any mistakes. e.g. one S106 mentioned defined the wrong parish (Harwell, not E Hendred) for receipt of tennis court money. A draft of the near final S106 should be provided to those</p>	<p>examples of members of the community finding these forums beneficial.</p> <p>Decision notices are placed on the website once a decision has been made on an application. Any problems with individual cases, should be discussed with the case officer.</p> <p>The process at planning committee is provided for in Council's constitution and cannot be amended through the SCI.</p> <p>S106: Paragraph 26.3 provides appropriate guidance on this, stating that "We do not consult on Section 106 agreements - this is not a statutory duty. However, we seek confirmation from towns and parishes on community facilities that the new development may impact upon or require improvement as a result of the development. Once we have an agreement and the development has commenced, we will notify towns and parish councils and meetings of the sums available for identified community facilities and provide an update to them on a six-monthly basis."</p>		

Name/ Organisation/ Comment ID	Comment Summary	Officer Response	Proposed Modification	Agree/ Disagree with Modification and reason why
	<p>affected by it for review/checking prior to final agreement.</p> <p>In the 'Who we consult with' section, please re-instate a) the commitment for wider notification for major applications and b) the option of email alerts. SCI must include details of how one can register for planning notifications.</p> <p>Under Planning Enforcements, the statements need to be backed up with actions.</p> <p>There needs to be an additional paragraph defining how the 'reporter' and the public will be kept informed of the status of the breach and the remedial actions sought.</p> <p>In Appendix A, where it states, "applications affecting the character and appearance of a conservation area" Shouldn't these also be notified to landowners/occupiers?</p>	<p>We will consider re-instating the commitment for wider notification for major applications. Email alerts are still an option, and this is set out in the table at paragraph 21.1.</p> <p>The Council will keep the complainant informed of the progress. This information is available on the Council website: http://www.whitehorsedc.gov.uk/services-and-advice/planning-and-building/planning-enforcement/how-we-deal-with-complaints.</p> <p>The table in appendix A is based on guidance set out in national legislation. Adjacent neighbours to the application will be notified as set out in section 2 of the SCI.</p>	<p>Consider re-instating the following; 'In most cases, where new development (e.g. 'major' application) affects more properties than those that are immediately adjacent to the boundary of the site, wider consultation may be carried out.'</p>	<p>Agree with modification to provide further clarity.</p>
Response 39	<p>Wants to know how officers decide if stakeholder and public comments are valid and if applicants are made aware of these. Feels that applicants do not answer questions.</p> <p>Has found examples of incorrect application documentation in the past.</p>	<p>Applicants are made aware of the validity of comments and officer's conclusions are set out in the Officer / Delegated Report.</p> <p>If errors are found in applications that are minor and therefore do not affect the application as a whole, the applicant would not be expected to re-apply or re write their forms.</p>		

Name/ Organisation/ Comment ID	Comment Summary	Officer Response	Proposed Modification	Agree/ Disagree with Modification and reason why
	Would like errors in initial application forms to be picked up – concerned that errors are overlooked in full applications.			
Roger Cox	The revised SCI is clear, logical and deals with all aspects of local authority planning, with links to the background detail. I consider it to be a useful guide which would enable all parts of the community to engage in the planning process.	Noted and support welcomed.		
Need not Greed Oxfordshire	<p>Key concerns include;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key evidence documents such as the Housing Needs assessment should be subject to a transparent public debate and community involvement should be extended to the earliest part of the process. • An option based purely on the natural growth needs of the existing population should be considered when assessing the levels of growth. • There should be more clarity on how comments received during consultations are taken on board and how documents are modified to reflect these. <p>Recommends an additional objective to paragraph 1.2 (proposed wording suggested can be found in full response).</p>	<p>The council acknowledges the comments made by Need not Greed Oxfordshire.</p> <p>The level of growth within the district is not an issue to be considered by the SCI. The SCI sets out the stages of consultation for development plan documents, and when representations can be made on the proposed document and accompanying evidence base. Draft evidence-based documents are available at either Regulation 18 or 19 consultation for public consultation and comments received will be considered when finalising policy documents.</p> <p>The council will consider the additional proposed objective when finalising the SCI.</p>	Need Not Greed suggest the council consider amending	Agreed in principle – 1.2 already mentions

Name/ Organisation/ Comment ID	Comment Summary	Officer Response	Proposed Modification	Agree/ Disagree with Modification and reason why
	<p>Recommends three changes to Figure one;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add footnote to Figure 1 setting out what is meant by pre-production stage (proposed wording suggested can be found in full response). • Amend the third box from the top to ‘respond clearly and publicly to representations received and where appropriate modify the plan accordingly.’ • Amend the sixth box from the top to ‘respond clearly and publicly to representations received and where appropriate modify the plan accordingly’. <p>Paragraph 6.2 should make clear how the effectiveness of the SCI will be reviewed. It should set out what targets there are for public engagement</p> <p>Reference to European Directive EC/2001/42 in paragraph 11.9 and the footnote on page 16 needs to be reconsidered. It should be noted that the alternatives to this legislation is unclear. They would be unhappy if there is any weakening of the Environmental standards. Consider mentioning the climate crisis and the key zero carbon reduction targets.</p> <p>The reasons for concerns about the level of growth include;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no clear national spatial policy, instead there seems to be a ‘development-everywhere’ approach. 	<p>The council considers Figure 1 to accurately represent the necessary stages involved in the production of a development plan document.</p> <p>There are no set targets for public engagement, however the Council is continually trying to improve its methods to reach more people.</p> <p>Paragraph 6.2 explains that the SCI will be updated to take account of changes in legislation. If there are changes to legislation mentioned within the SCI, there is scope for the SCI to be updated to take into account the changes.</p> <p>The remaining points relate to a matter of policy. The SCI sets out how the LPA will engage with the community on planning documents. Representations regarding policy will need to be made on the appropriate document and at the appropriate time.</p>	<p>paragraph 1.2 to add the following: ‘To give local people and organisations various opportunities to get involved and influence and guide local plans and planning applications’</p>	<p>some of these points relating to opportunities but part of the wording will be incorporated, i.e. ‘and highlights the opportunities for local communities to provide comments on new planning documents, such as Local Plans, and how they might be involved in the development of their local area/district.</p>

Name/ Organisation/ Comment ID	Comment Summary	Officer Response	Proposed Modification	Agree/ Disagree with Modification and reason why
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The previous plans were entirely based on one set of figures from the Oxfordshire SHMA which was produced by GL Hearn. • Once these figures were 'accepted', they were beyond challenge by local people. Valid claims were made at Local Plan Examinations but were dismissed. • The risks of a jobs-led strategy were not recognised or mitigated and there was no contingency planning for the risk that job growth might not materialise. • There are proposals to build 1 million more homes in the Oxford/Cambridge Arc. With this, there is uncertainty surrounding the Oxford to Cambridge Expressway. • There has been a standoff between SODC councillors and government minister Robert Jenrick about progressing the South Local Plan. The timetable set by Jenrick is unlikely to be the last word and can be overcome by the plan being out of date and the Coronavirus crisis having an effect. • These problems are further illuminated by the housing developments known as North and North West Abingdon. The concerns for these sites are set out in Appendix 1 of the full response. <p><i>(Further explanation on these points can be found in the full response).</i></p> <p>The focus should be on proper balance of economic, environmental and social considerations; local democracy controlled by locally elected and</p>			

Name/ Organisation/ Comment ID	Comment Summary	Officer Response	Proposed Modification	Agree/ Disagree with Modification and reason why
	<p>accountable councillors; and environmental and rural sustainability, putting landscape, nature and rural communities at the heart of decision-making.</p> <p>Concern raised about the imposition of excessive growth and centralisation by Whitehall. The Arc pressures may mean that planning history will repeat itself in next Vale of White Horse Local Plan.</p> <p>Local People and organisations must be consulted about the overall level of growth.</p>			
Thames Water	<p>New developments may increase the requirements for water and wastewater infrastructure. The timescale for delivering this infrastructure can be time consuming. Developers are encouraged to work with Thames Water at an early stage to minimise the need for phasing conditions on planning permissions and to ensure new development is aligned with any infrastructure upgrades required. Refers to Paragraph 40 of the NPPF where it encourages developers to engage with local communities and statutory and non-statutory consultees before submitting their applications.</p> <p>Would welcome text within SCI that encouraging developers to seek pre-application advice with Thames Water to discuss any water and wastewater infrastructure required to support the development. Thames Water provided a link to include within the SCI or on the Council Website.</p>	<p>Noted. The SCI sets out how the LPA will engage with the local community and key stakeholders such as Thames Water.</p> <p>The remaining points relate to a matter of policy. The SCI sets out how the LPA will engage with the community on planning documents. Representations regarding policy will need to be made on the appropriate document and at the appropriate time.</p> <p>Comment noted and agreed.</p>	<p>Potentially seek to add a sentence to section 19: Pre-Application Advice to encourage applicants to seek advice from other key stakeholders such as Thames Water.</p>	<p>Agreed – reminds applicants of further steps / provides clarity. Suggested change taken forward.</p>

Name/ Organisation/ Comment ID	Comment Summary	Officer Response	Proposed Modification	Agree/ Disagree with Modification and reason why
Ms Nicholson	<p>Asks about engaging with the local community (i.e. what methods of communication) and wants the Council to give 'recognition of present weaknesses in such methods and what you might do to improve this'.</p> <p>Clear language and accessibility are all very well, but if the channels themselves are weak, it is all pointless.</p>	<p>Paragraphs 9.5 and 21.1 of the Statement of Community Involvement set out the methods of engagement we will undertake when consulting on Planning Policy documents and on planning applications. We will continue to work with our Community Engagement Team to ensure our methods are effective in informing people of any consultations we are undertaking.</p>		
Mrs Wooldridge	<p>It seems clear. One of the issues with putting things out for public approval is that if you steer the questions appropriately it is pretty easy to get an answer you want. In this case, approval of this paper.</p>	<p>Noted. We will discuss with our Community Engagement Team.</p>		