

# Joint Statement of Community Involvement

## Consultation Statement



**DECEMBER 2021**

## **Statement of Community Involvement (SCI)**







1. There is no requirement to consult on a SCI, however, it is good practice to do so. A six-week public consultation on the draft SCI ran from 8 September – 20 October 2021. 109 complete responses were received. This included responses from statutory consultees, parish council's and organisations, with the highest number of responses submitted by members of the public (71%).

## **Consultation responses**

2. The consultation survey asked six questions about the SCI. For the first four questions, respondents could choose their level of agreement to a statement, ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. There was also the opportunity to leave a free text response for each question. The first three questions related to the three sections of the SCI: Introduction, Planning Policy, and Development Management, and asked whether respondents found that the information was presented in a simple and easy to understand way. For these three questions the majority of respondents stated that they either strongly agreed or agreed that the information was presented in a simple and easy to understand way – the breakdown of responses is presented below:






**Q1: Section 1 Introduction - Overall did you find that the information in this section was presented in a simple and easy to understand way?**

3. 73% strongly agreed or agreed. Only 8% of respondents either disagreed or strongly disagreed.

Answer Choices			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Strongly agree		18.39%	16
2	Agree		55.17%	48
3	Neutral		17.24%	15
4	Disagree		4.60%	4
5	Strongly disagree		3.45%	3
6	I don't have a view		1.15%	1







**Q2: Section 2 Planning Policy - Overall did you find that the information in this section was presented in a simple and easy to understand way?**

4. 60% strongly agreed or agreed. 13% disagreed or strongly disagreed.







Answer Choices			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Strongly agree		16.28%	14
2	Agree		44.19%	38
3	Neutral		26.74%	23
4	Disagree		8.14%	7
5	Strongly disagree		4.65%	4
6	I don't have a view		0.00%	0

**Q3: Section 3 Development Management - Overall did you find that the information in this section was presented in a simple and easy to understand way?**

5. 62% strongly agreed or agreed. 13% disagreed or strongly disagreed.

Answer Choices			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Strongly agree		12.94%	11
2	Agree		49.41%	42
3	Neutral		23.53%	20
4	Disagree		8.24%	7
5	Strongly disagree		4.71%	4
6	I don't have a view		1.18%	1

6. **Question 4** asked respondents whether they agree that the processes set out in the SCI will enable communities to be informed and have timely and meaningful opportunities to have a say on any planning proposals. There was more of a mixed response to this question, the largest percentage of respondents selected Neutral. Slightly more respondents answered that they agree or strongly agree (37%) than disagree or strongly disagree (31%), but it was a close outcome.

Answer Choices			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Strongly agree		11.90%	10
2	Agree		25.00%	21
3	Neutral		30.95%	26
4	Disagree		21.43%	18
5	Strongly disagree		9.52%	8
6	I don't have a view		1.19%	1

7. **Question 5** asked whether respondents had any comments on the general format of the SCI (52 responses). Question 6 provided the opportunity for respondents to leave any other comments (59 responses). These questions were free text questions. All of the comments have been read and the points that were raised most frequently are listed below:

- The document is clear, easy to understand and well presented
- Good use of diagrams
- The SCI is too long / too detailed / contains too much information
- A sense that consultation is a tick box exercise and people's view are not taken into account
- Developers / housebuilders / colleges / central government have too much control over where development happens
- More dialogue is needed to make consultation meaningful, including receiving feedback on consultations
- There should be more engagement at pre-application stage

- Greater emphasis needed on complying with neighbourhood plan policies
  - Some planning processes not subject to consultation and transparent – e.g. discharge of conditions
  - The hierarchy of planning documents is not clear
8. Some people commenting felt the council could do more to explain how their comments had influenced the work the council was doing. To address these concerns, the council will be using the consultation on the SCI to trial a new form of infographic feedback document – this infographic will form the focus of follow-up communications to inform residents of how they've influenced the SCI, and if successful, similar infographics and communications will be after relevant public consultation or engagement exercises.
9. A summary of all the consultation responses received, along with an officer response and proposed amendments, can be found at **Appendix 1**.

## Appendix 1

### Summary table of comments – Joint SCI

Section 1 provides an introduction to the SCI, and information on the councils' overall approach to community engagement and involvement in the planning process.

Q1. Overall did you find that the information in this section was presented in a simple and easy to understand way?

Name/ Organisation/ Comment ID	Comment Summary	Officer Response	Proposed Modification (if any)
ID: 174155654	Seems colleges have all the power around Oxford, if they want something built it gets done regardless.	This SCI sets out the statutory process for assessing planning applications and preparing plan making documents, which are then followed by the councils. Comments submitted about particular developments are carefully considered as part of the assessment process.	
ID: 174167724	Wording was clear and direct. Flow diagrams provided a concise summary.	Noted	
ID: 174167953	Fine words but most feel their voices are heard but ignored unless they coincide with the council's plans.	The councils carefully consider all comments submitted on planning policy documents and planning applications and take these into account alongside national and local policies when making decisions.	
ID: 174160763	Reads like a white paper. Lots of technical terms and formal language. Could be more diagrams and examples. Doesn't read as though involvement or community are welcome.	The SCI has been written in a way that aims to explain the consultation process in an easy to understand way, without over simplifying the process. A glossary is included to explain the technical terms. It uses several flow charts and diagrams to explain the process and supplement the text. We fully encourage community involvement in the planning process.	



<b>Name/ Organisation/ Comment ID</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Officer Response</b>	<b>Proposed Modification (if any)</b>
ID: 174201658	Information was fine - however, I am used to reading and assimilating content and objectives of large documents.	Noted	
ID: 174217905	Flowcharts in all sections very helpful.	Noted	
ID: 174229530	No comment.	Noted	
ID: 174357995	More about ticking boxes. Does not explain what consultation methods I can expect.	The methods for consultation on planning policy documents is set out on p22 and for planning applications on p28 of the SCl.	
ID: 174420959	Set out legislative position and made vague positive comments without saying anything useful.	Noted	
ID: 174573133	No one listens to the community view. House builders win out.	The councils carefully consider all comments submitted on planning policy documents and planning applications and take these into account alongside national and local policies when making decisions.	
ID: 174618685	It does the job.	Noted	
ID: 174852486	Too long	Noted. The document contains several flow charts and diagrams which do make it longer. It contains information that we feel people will find helpful in understanding who how and when we consult.	
ID: 175093121	Too much information for someone who hasn't been involved in planning.	Noted – the document does contain a lot of information. There is a balance between providing all the information that we need to so that people are informed, and trying to keep the document	

Name/ Organisation/ Comment ID	Comment Summary	Officer Response	Proposed Modification (if any)
		short. We have tried to get the balance right and do not want to omit information that may be useful.	
ID: 175102902	<p>Developers control where development goes. Local communities are distanced.</p> <p>Where does the SCI demonstrate the will/ power to change the approach to planning to address climate change? How is engagement demonstrated? The methods of engagement are proportionate and meaningful to whom?</p>	<p>This SCI sets out the statutory process for assessing planning applications and preparing plan making documents, which are then followed by the councils. The councils carefully consider all comments submitted on planning policy documents and planning applications and take these into account alongside national and local policies when making decisions.</p> <p>Climate change is an important consideration when developing planning policy, and will be addressed through the joint local plan.</p> <p>A consultation statement is prepared after formal consultations that sets out how engagement was undertaken, what the responses were and how the responses have been considered.</p>	
ID: 175210775	<p>Language not as simple as suggested e.g., infrastructure can mean different things. If simple English no word should be more than two syllables.</p> <p>Central Government sets the scene of what you can do and VWHDC follows the rules. Not made very clear leaving the reader believing their voice counts, which I do not believe is correct.</p>	<p>Noted. We will add infrastructure to the glossary. Under the CIL section the SCI gives examples of infrastructure eg transport schemes, leisure facilities etc to help explain what it means.</p> <p>The councils make decisions in line with national and local policy.</p>	Add Infrastructure to glossary
ID: 175314624	42 pages too in depth but text and diagrams were clear.	Noted – the document does contain a lot of information. There is a balance between providing all the information that we need to so that people are informed, and trying to keep the document	

Name/ Organisation/ Comment ID	Comment Summary	Officer Response	Proposed Modification (if any)
		short. We have tried to get the balance right and do not want to omit information that may be useful.	
ID: 175228434	No indication of the process when 'consultation' shows that the proposal is not in agreement with the community's desires.	The SCI sets out consultation processes that we carry out in line with Regulations. The councils have to consider a number of factors in progressing with policy documents and determining applications. Consultation is a one of the key factors: we read all responses to consultations and give them careful consideration.	
ID: 175340758	Welcome the opportunity to comment on the draft Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) from the perspective of citizens with disabilities.	Noted	
ID: 175722188	Visually clear and jargon free.	Noted	
ID: 175817477	Page 3, Paragraph 1.6 "TThe Statement of Community Involvement will be adopted by both councils..." (typo)	Noted	Correct typo on page 3.
ID: 176389843	Council is unable to deliver on the aims set out in the SCI because of government pressure for development.	Government has set out a clear intention within their policies, including the National Planning Policy Framework to 'significantly boost the supply of homes'. This is taken forward by the Councils at the local level through our adopted plans.	
ID: 176530958	Simple and straightforward but rather long - only for those dedicated enough to want to contribute.	Noted.	
ID: 176744593	Too long, needs to be more reader friendly.  Ideals are plausible but track record on customer	The SCI is a statutory document which sets out how we engage with local communities (local residents, businesses, organisations and statutory consultees). We have, as concisely as possible,	

Name/ Organisation/ Comment ID	Comment Summary	Officer Response	Proposed Modification (if any)
	engagement has been poor. Needs to be a change in culture if the LA is to get near its objectives.	provided all the information needed and have used diagrams and other graphical design to make this user-friendly.	
ID: 176747450	Long winded and unspecific on how you engage with members of the public e.g. timescales and where, if people were looking for information, they could go on your website. Was helpful to say where people could sign up to receive emails.	The methods for consultation on planning policy documents is set out on p22 and for planning applications on p28 of the SCI. The SCI does include links to the councils' websites, we will review if there are other places where links can usefully be inserted.	Check all opportunities for linking to the councils' websites are included
ID: 176864529	What do you mean by meaningful engagement and what shape might the involvement take?  What redress do individuals/organisations have if they feel the council have not lived up to the statements in 1.14?	The methods for consultation on planning policy documents is set out on p22 and for planning applications on p28 of the SCI. The SCI sets out the different methods that can be used, depending on the type of document being prepared, or the type of application being consulted on. The councils carefully consider all comments submitted on planning policy documents and planning applications and take these into account alongside national and local policies when making decisions.	Add contact details of councils' complaints procedure
ID: 176920974	Clear and easy to understand. Could include explicit 'measures of success' allowing the council to demonstrate that it has met its vision. Could demonstrate that effective and fair engagement and involvement on the criteria (particularly sections 1.8, 1.10, 1.11) had been met - building public trust in the planning process.	There are no set targets for public engagement, however the councils are continually trying to improve its methods to reach more people.	
ID: 176916499	Unfortunate that many of the aims cannot be carried out in practice due to policy pressure for housing in Didcot.	Government has set out a clear intention within their policies, including the National Planning Policy Framework to 'significantly boost the supply of	

Name/ Organisation/ Comment ID	Comment Summary	Officer Response	Proposed Modification (if any)
		homes'. This is taken forward by the councils at the local level through our adopted plans.	
ID: 176942204	Add Sustainable to the vision.	Sustainability is a key element of planning policy and will be covered in the joint local plan. The SCI relates to consultation and engagement. We explain how digital engagement has had benefits for carbon reduction.	
ID: 175704669	<p>(Full comment provides extensive background and context to below summary) Approval of planning applications has not been consistent with local and national policy.</p> <p>It may be that where we live means that we cannot participate in any 'Community Involvement' activity. If so, we should have discussion, and formal statement from, the LPA to clarify.</p> <p>Nothing to indicate what residents can do when we can demonstrate that either 'consultation' or 'planning applications' are not dealt with fairly, equally or meaningfully. Views are ignored. Apart from typos, some paragraphs raise questions of detail:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Para 1.2 – what does 'fully informed' mean?</li> <li>2. Para 1.3 – how is 'successfully' defined?</li> <li>3. Para 1.6 – who decides what changes are necessary and which comments are not to be included?</li> </ol>	<p>The SCI sets out the processes for consultation on planning policy documents and planning applications, which are followed by the councils. All comments are carefully considered alongside national and local policies.</p> <p>We provide various ways in which the public can get involved in consultations, including signing up for email alerts to receive notifications by email.</p> <p>The councils consider that the SCI appropriately covers how to access applications, how to respond to applications and the grounds for objections. The councils' websites also provides further detail on this. If you have further questions, you may wish to contact our Customer Services Team by telephone (01235 422600) or via email - <a href="mailto:planning.policy@southandvale.gov.uk">planning.policy@southandvale.gov.uk</a></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</p>	<p>Para 1.2 change wording to active language eg 'be empowered'</p>

Name/ Organisation/ Comment ID	Comment Summary	Officer Response	Proposed Modification (if any)
	<p>4. Para 1.9 – Suggest that the 3rd word is ‘communities’ or 2nd line ‘they’ is changed to ‘you’.</p> <p>6. Para 1.14 We have seen application full of jargon to try to push through approval whilst giving as little useful information to the local community. How would this be countered by the LPA?</p> <p>7. Para 1.14 – penultimate bullet, it is not clear how this can be achieved.</p>	<p>made publicly available online at the earliest opportunity, once the consultation has finished.</p> <p>The councils have to consider a number of factors in progressing with policy documents and determining applications. Consultation is a one of the key factors: the councils read all responses to consultations and gives them careful consideration.</p> <p>There are no set targets for public engagement, however the councils are continually trying to improve its methods to reach more people.</p> <p>Noted and agreed</p> <p>Planning application documents are uploaded on to the website. Please let us know if there are missing documents on a certain case. For planning applications it is not possible to respond to individual comments due to the large number of comments that we receive.</p>	<p>Change para 1.9 to: We want communities to have the...</p>

Name/ Organisation/ Comment ID	Comment Summary	Officer Response	Proposed Modification (if any)
ID: 177003178	The Consultation and Community Engagement team have reviewed the draft SCI and will send comments under separate cover.	Noted	
ID: 177003949	Long winded and unspecific on how you engage with members of the public, e.g. timescales and where, if people were looking for information they could go on your website. Was helpful to say where people could sign up to receive emails.	The methods for consultation on planning policy documents is set out on p22 and for planning applications on p28 of the SCI. The SCI does include links to the councils websites, we will review if there are other places where links can usefully be inserted.	
ID: 177039688	Vision should include the word 'sustainable'.	Sustainability is a key element of planning policy. The SCI relates to consultation and engagement. We explain how digital engagement has had benefits for carbon reduction.	

**Section 2 of the draft SCI provides information on how you can get involved with and influence the councils as we prepare the Local Plan and other planning policy documents including Neighbourhood Plans.**

**Q2. Overall did you find that the information in this section was presented in a simple and easy to understand way?**

Name/ Organisation/ Comment ID	Comment Summary	Officer Response	Proposed Modification (if any)
ID: 174153472	Too long winded. Length will reduce the amount of feedback you receive and thus community input.	We have, as concisely as possible, provided all the information needed and have used diagrams and flow charts to supplement the text to make this user-friendly	

Name/ Organisation/ Comment ID	Comment Summary	Officer Response	Proposed Modification (if any)
ID: 174155654	Even if councils object they just go over your head.	The councils make decisions in line with national and local policy.	
ID: 174159838	<p>Clear but too much information for most people to read. Diagrams are useful.</p> <p>Language in places could be judged as directive: is the recent government planning legislation intended to 'streamline &amp; modernise' the planning system, or to allow development to pass through without question?</p>	<p>We have, as concisely as possible, provided all the information needed and have used diagrams and flow charts to supplement the text to make this user-friendly</p> <p>The Governments stated objective is to streamline and modernise the planning process.</p>	
ID: 174161312	A great deal of information to absorb.	Noted – the document does contain a lot of information. There is a balance between providing all the information that we need to so that people are informed, and trying to keep the document short. We have tried to get the balance right and do not want to omit information that may be useful.	
ID: 174167724	Clear wording and good summary flow charts.	Noted	
ID: 174167953	Meaningless. Council has no intention of acting on input from the community unless it follows the Council's plan.	We consider a number of factors in progressing with policy documents and determining applications. Consultation is one of the key factors: we read all responses to consultations and give them careful consideration.	
ID: 174160763	<p>The document is both trying to lay out the legislative/regulatory framework as in a government paper and trying to solicit involvement. Some statements are highly inaccessible.</p> <p>Can add links to the actual documents for those who want to go into detail, but this is about community involvement - need to make the key ideas clear and make us feel our views count. Try to understand what</p>	Noted – the document does contain a lot of information. There is a balance between providing all the information that we need to so that people are informed, and trying to keep the document short. We have tried to get the balance right and do not want to omit information that may be useful. The text needs to strike a balance. The document must be clear in explaining what the councils are doing	



Name/ Organisation/ Comment ID	Comment Summary	Officer Response	Proposed Modification (if any)
	it is like for people on the outside who feel disempowered and disillusioned with politics.	<p>and why. There is a risk that the text can become oversimplified.</p> <p>Links are included in the document for readers wishing to find out more information.</p>	
ID: 174182653	<p>Key stage diagram does not indicate that notice will be taken of comments made. Extra stage needed after Reg 19 to indicate that comments will be considered and alterations made. This stage has been included for SPDs and other documents. Appreciate that diagram shows minimum requirements, but does not reflect comments made elsewhere in the document e.g., that you value community input.</p> <p>The diagram on how you will consult does not include exhibitions/meetings even though you indicate you may do this.</p> <p>Diagram 6 is difficult to understand and uninformative - particularly the relationships between the different plans and who will prepare them.</p> <p>For neighbourhood plans an extra stage needs to be included after Reg 14.</p>	<p>Comments made at Regulation 19 stage are sent to the examiner, any changes made to the plan must be done through the examination process. The diagram shows the key stages and focuses on the statutory requirements for plan making.</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted – this diagram is perhaps not necessary for the SCI and should be removed. This diagram would sit better in the joint local plan and could be included in the new joint Local plan.</p> <p>Noted – the text will be amended to reflect that changes may be made to the draft plan as a result of the comments received during consultation</p> <p>Noted – typo, should read ‘Documents...’</p>	<p>Add exhibition / events to diagram p. 22</p> <p>Remove diagram 6</p> <p>Add text to p13</p> <p>Add ‘s’ to Document</p>

Name/ Organisation/ Comment ID	Comment Summary	Officer Response	Proposed Modification (if any)
	The definition of Development Plan in the glossary is incorrect. It is not just a document listing plans, it is the policies and content in all the plan documents.		
ID: 174202530	Focus reads from a council perspective. E.g., Diagram 1 has the second consultation in brackets - but that is an important part of the engagement process from the point of view of a person trying to engage with planning.	Noted and amended	Amend text - Consultation on Publication version of Plan (minimum 6 weeks)(p8)
ID: 174229530	No comment.	Noted	
ID: 174357995	More should be done on explaining how consultation will actually be done	We have tried to provide enough information to keep people informed about we will consult on planning policy and planning applications in a concise way so that the document is not too long and is easy to read. The methods for consultation on planning policy documents is set out on p22 and for planning applications on p28 of the SCI.	
ID: 174420959	Section 1 set out the legislative position and made general vague positive comments without saying anything useful	Section 1 introduces the document. Further detail is found in sections 2 and 3.	
ID: 174573133	Develop on brownfield land and improve/redevelop old areas instead of digging up valuable fields.	Development is dealt with via Planning Policy, rather than the SCI. The SCI deals with how the LPA will engage with the community.	
ID: 174618685	Flow charts were reasonably easy to follow but text is vague and unhelpful.	Noted. The diagrams are intended to supplement the text.	
ID: 174852486	Couldn't it be summarised. 42 pages is too much.	Noted – the document does contain a lot of information. There is a balance between providing all the information that we need to so that people are informed, and trying to keep the document	

Name/ Organisation/ Comment ID	Comment Summary	Officer Response	Proposed Modification (if any)
		short. We have tried to get the balance right and do not want to omit information that may be useful.	
ID: 174886382	<p>Too detailed - likely hard for non-specialists to absorb.</p> <p>Big weakness of present system is that it is reactive. Outside the limited constraints of a Neighbourhood Plan - system gives very little opportunity for communities to promote own visions for the future.</p>	<p>Noted – the document does contain a lot of information. There is a balance between providing all the information that we need to so that people are informed, and trying to keep the document short. We have tried to get the balance right and do not want to omit information that may be useful.</p> <p>Neighbourhood planning is strongly supported by the councils and groups are provided with support from a dedicated team.</p>	
ID: 175102902	<p>Section includes plenty of opportunities for consultation but how 'top down'/'bottom up' is it? Too much bureaucracy in neighbourhood plan preparation. Not possible to impose policy at parish level that hasn't been adopted by the Local Plan. Hands are tied behind our backs – local people might want to progress more quickly than those at local or national level.</p> <p>Who is involved in the 'Pre-production stage' of 'evidence gathering and early engagement'?</p> <p>Changes to planning systems demonstrate local community powerlessness. Perhaps engagement in the planning process should be measured, not a series of aspirations about technical communication.</p>	<p>The SCI cannot set out new policy or make changes to national policy.</p> <p>The planning policy team are involved in the pre-production stage and evidence gathering when preparing a local plan or SPD. For neighbourhood plans, the neighbourhood group is responsible for this, with support from the planning policy team.</p> <p>There are no set targets for public engagement, however we are continually trying to improve our methods to reach more people.</p>	

Name/ Organisation/ Comment ID	Comment Summary	Officer Response	Proposed Modification (if any)
ID: 175210775	If under 50% of people make comments then VWHDC should consider whether they are getting sufficient feedback and what steps they need to take to achieve 50% minimum to be truly representative.	That would be contrary to national policy	
ID: 175228434	<p>How will 'meaningful engagement' result in changes to/ cancellation of proposals?</p> <p>If, following 'consultation', the views of the local community are at odds with the 'planning process' how will the Council ensure that that the community's views prevail?</p> <p>What happens if at the end of the local plan development process the proposals are not acceptable to either the community and/or the Council?</p> <p>If neighbourhood plan is subject to referendum surely the local plan should be as well.</p>	<p>The councils have to consider a number of factors in progressing with policy documents and determining applications. Consultation is one of the key factors: we read all responses to consultations and give them careful consideration.</p> <p>Local plans cannot be subject to local referendum, they go through an independent examination process before adoption by full Council.</p>	
ID: 175340758	Most of what we say applies more widely to the council and preparing this response has encouraged us to take these issues up elsewhere.	Noted	
ID: 175358522	Issue with the website not having live links. Have attempted to share links with residents to parts of the planning portal, but links don't work because of the way the data is stored. Makes it much harder to share info.	Noted and will raise with the communications team.	
ID: 175795051	Too much information. Only include info that is relevant.	Noted – the document does contain a lot of information. There is a balance between providing all the information that we need to so that people are informed, and trying to keep the document	

Name/ Organisation/ Comment ID	Comment Summary	Officer Response	Proposed Modification (if any)
		short. We have tried to get the balance right and do not want to omit information that may be useful.	
ID: 175817477	Page 14 - Preparing a Neighbourhood Plan diagram. The "Monitoring and Review" stage is not explained in the previous text. This should be given some explanation given that a lot of Neighbourhood Plans in the District will be reviewed in the next 5 years.	This section should be removed to make consistent with others – all plans need monitoring and review – as set out in the monitoring section.	Remove last box from diagram p14
ID: 176389843	Focus on digital may have enabled some to participate but disenfranchised those without internet access. Currently no other way to address the Planning Committee even if in the same room as members. Hope that once temporary measures expire (2.43) paper copies will be available for larger applications. Impossible to read documents for developments of 100+ on-screen and get any context.	Noted. Restrictions have meant we have had to change how some meetings are run.  The office is currently not open to the public and an appointment must be made if anyone wishes to view hard copy documents.  The council's have declared climate emergencies and are taking measures to reduce our carbon footprint by reducing printing.	
ID: 176530958	More useful if you have previously seen a local plan - otherwise you are guessing. Very clear in terms of process.	Noted	
ID: 176744593	The general public mistrust the planning system and the view is it doesn't matter what we say they will do what they want. Planners are often too pally with planning professionals, consultants and builders and the views of the general public seem to be second best and unimportant.	Officers maintain professional working relationships with all internal and external stakeholders. The councils are working within a planning framework set nationally.	
ID: 176747450	Long winded. Would be helpful to list all the planning policy documents and explain their hierarchy. Links to information re: generation to neighbourhood plan very useful.	Noted. We will consider adding links to external websites to explain the hierarchy of documents	Remove diagram 6, replace with diagram

Name/ Organisation/ Comment ID	Comment Summary	Officer Response	Proposed Modification (if any)
			showing the Development Plan
ID: 176864529	<p>Para 2.29, Typo</p> <p>Several parish/town councils have been through NP process and are helping those starting the process. Mention of this could be useful</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>This may be usefully be added to the neighbourhood planning section of the website rather than in the SCI.</p>	Correct 'accordnsce' typo in Para 2.29
ID: 176920974	<p>Relatively large number of related documents discussed but interrelating framework is not easy to understand. Does not show hierarchal or legal relationships or how they will be referenced and weighted in implementing planning policy and making planning decisions.</p> <p>Discussion of the legal weight of different plans and how they are utilised at a planning policy level. Would be useful.</p> <p>Including explicit measures against which progress towards goals is measured, would enable the council to demonstrate it has satisfied its commitments on engagement, consultation and feedback.</p>	<p>The purpose of the SCI is to set out how the councils engage in preparing local plans and deciding planning applications. Further information on how planning applications are determined, including the consideration of material considerations can be found on the websites.</p> <p>The SCI should only cover consultation and engagement practices, there is a risk that the SCI encompasses too much information that is best covered in other documents / online, to avoid the SCI becoming too long.</p> <p>There are no set targets for public engagement, however we are continually trying to improve our methods to reach more people. After each formal consultation the we produce a consultation statement that summarises and addresses all comments received.</p>	Remove diagram 6, replace with diagram showing the Development Plan
ID: 176918135	Not clear whether Ox-Cam Spatial Framework will form part of the Development Plan and how it will relate to the Oxfordshire Plan 2050 and Joint Local Plan.	The SCI deals specifically with consultation and engagement on planning policy and planning applications. There is a risk that the SCI encompasses too much information that is best	Remove diagram 6 and replace with graphic

Name/ Organisation/ Comment ID	Comment Summary	Officer Response	Proposed Modification (if any)
	<p>Would be helpful if there is a facility to download a draft response to online consultations so that we can consult Society members prior to submitting. A facility to download a copy of our final response as a PDF file would be useful.</p>	<p>covered in other documents / online, to avoid the SCI becoming too long.</p> <p>We will pass this request on to IT to see if this is possible.</p>	<p>showing Development Plan</p>
ID: 175704669	<p>No mention of LDOs nor Framework Masterplans</p> <p>How will the LPA guarantee that an SPD (and LDO) will adhere to National guidance, Local Plans (including SCI para 2.8), professional/national guidance and industry standards if there is no independent examination?</p> <p>Is the AMR explicit enough - contains statements that appear to be inconsistent. E.g., para 8.43 states that less than half of the sites had a masterplan, yet on page 85, CP38 (All major development has a masterplan and D&amp;A statement) claims to have been 'achieved'.</p>	<p>The SCI covers the main planning policy documents that the councils produce. For further information or for any questions on other documents please contact us by telephone (01235 422600) or via email - <a href="mailto:planning.policy@southandvale.gov.uk">planning.policy@southandvale.gov.uk</a></p> <p>SPD's once adopted are a material planning consideration in planning decisions. SPDs are prepared in line with the relevant regulations and in line with national policy.</p> <p>This comment relates to the AMR and a specific policy, which is not covered by the SCI</p>	
ID: 177003949	<p>Long winded. Would be helpful to list all planning policy documents and explain their hierarchy.</p> <p>How do planning committees link into the local town and parish neighbourhood plans?</p>	<p>The SCI deals specifically with consultation and engagement on planning policy and planning applications. There is a risk that the SCI encompasses too much information that is best covered in other documents / online, to avoid the SCI becoming too long.</p> <p>Please see the councils' websites and constitutions for details on how committees operate.</p>	<p>Remove diagram 6, replace with diagram showing the Development Plan</p>

Name/ Organisation/ Comment ID	Comment Summary	Officer Response	Proposed Modification (if any)
	<p>Are the Vale and South Planning approvals based on the town and parish neighbourhood plans.</p> <p>How will this link in with the new proposed planning regulations? This is not clear.</p>	<p>Planning proposals are assessed against all the relevant policies in national and local plans, including in made neighbourhood plans.</p> <p>The SCI does not go into detail on the proposed changes to the planning system. The SCI will be reviewed and updated if there are significant changes to how we consult in the future.</p>	
ID: 176857965	<p>Nothing to support Para 1.11 and Para 1.16 : the flowcharts do not provide for engagement until the council has formulated its ideas “on content, scope and/or preferred options.</p> <p>The section on “Who we Consult” makes no reference to the Planning Practice Guidance on non-statutory consultees. Would like to see a list of non-statutory consultees set up Also, a forum or citizens’ panel of interested people from all sectors of the community, providing the opportunity for meaningful two-way discussion.</p>	<p>The councils prepare all planning documents in line with national legislation and guidance. The councils work within the planning framework set nationally. We also must take into account the timeframe for preparing documents.</p> <p>The SCI gives examples of some statutory consultees (specific) but does not list any examples of non-statutory consultees (general)</p> <p>We will consider adding more information about forums. 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 we will consider the use of a development forum</p>	<p>Amend headings above 2.29 and 2.30 to be clear of the difference between specific and general consultation bodies to refer to Under local interest groups insert eg wildlife groups</p>
ID: 177039688	<p>Would like to see a tightening of the exemptions to CIL, e.g., on self-build.</p>	<p>The SCI is not a policy document so cannot make changes to national or local policy.</p>	<p>Amend headings above 2.29 and 2.30 to be clear of the difference</p>



Name/ Organisation/ Comment ID	Comment Summary	Officer Response	Proposed Modification (if any)
	Note the absence of any named non-statutory organisations such as the Chiltern Society, CPRE, Woodland Trust, National Trust, etc. who all have an interest in the shaping of a planning policy. They should be named, under 2.29 or 2.30	The SCI gives examples of some statutory consultees (specific) but does not list any examples of non-statutory consultees (general)	between specific and general consultation bodies to refer to  Under local interest groups insert eg wildlife groups

**Section 3 of the draft SCI provides information on how to become involved with different aspects of development management including planning applications, planning appeals, Section 106 (planning obligations), pre-application advice and planning enforcement.**

**Q3. Overall did you find that the information in this section was presented in a simple and easy to understand way?**

Name/ Organisation/ Comment ID	Comment Summary	Officer Response	Proposed Modification (if any)
ID: 174155654	Don't think it matters what I say.	Noted. This SCI sets out the statutory process for assessing planning applications and preparing plan making documents, which are then followed by the councils. The councils consider all comments submitted on plan-making and planning applications.	
ID: 174158393	VoWH Council has failed to inform nearby properties about development applications. By luck only have I discovered nearby applications, many after consent had been given. I do not believe this will change	The table below Paragraph 3.5 sets out the methods by which we publicise planning applications. Diagram 7 sets out the minimum neighbourhood notification for all applications. The	

Name/ Organisation/ Comment ID	Comment Summary	Officer Response	Proposed Modification (if any)
	anything. I distrust the Council's intentions to permit local people to have a say.	SCI sets out the statutory process for assessing planning applications which is then followed by the councils.	
ID: 174159838	Diagrams & flow charts at the start make this a user-friendly section.	Noted.	
ID: 174161312	No comments.	Noted.	
ID: 174160763	This section is clearer. But why call it Development Management? So generic it could refer to anything that is developed or managed. Express this at citizen level. Put in a very simple case study that demonstrates the process.	Noted. The term Development Management is explained in Paragraph 3.1. It is used nationally in planning policy documents and planning legislation and should remain in the SCI for consistency and clarity. The SCI is not intended to explain the planning process, but sets out how we will consult.	
ID: 174202530	Is this document a policy or an explanation? Reads like it's not quite sure.	The SCI is a statutory document which sets out how we engage with local communities (local residents, businesses, organisations and statutory consultees).	
ID: 174203774	Would be useful to explain that pre-app advice will be based on policies in the local development plan.  Should be a statement about the advice given not being legally binding.	Noted. Clarification to be added into paragraph 3.30/3.31 that pre-application advice will be based on policies in the Local Development plan.  As noted in the SCI, further information regarding the pre-application advice process is given on the councils' websites which states advice is not binding	Make explicit reference to Local Development Plan in paragraph 3.30/3.31.
ID: 174229530	No comments.	Noted.	

Name/ Organisation/ Comment ID	Comment Summary	Officer Response	Proposed Modification (if any)
ID: 174573133	This is a tick box exercise.	The SCI is a statutory document	
ID: 174618685	More information about why applications go to committees would be appreciated.	The councils' constitutions set out the process for planning committee, rather than the SCI.	
ID: 174852486	42 pages is too much to read. Who is concentrating after the first paragraph.	We have, as concisely as possible, provided all the information needed and have used diagrams and other graphical design to make this user-friendly	
ID: 175102902	<p>Adherence to neighbourhood plan policies throughout the planning process should be emphasised.</p> <p>Frustrating to be presented with a development at 'outline planning' stage, to find that when a detailed planning application comes along, it is too late to change anything.</p> <p>What is the point in having planning enforcement if public perception is that it isn't carried out?</p> <p>What is done to enforce Discharges when it appears that they are sanctioned prior to developer action?</p>	<p>Planning proposals are assessed against all the relevant policies in national and local plans, including in made neighbourhood plans. The SCI is not a policy document. Adherence to policies are set out in the relevant local and neighbourhood plans.</p> <p>The SCI cannot make changes to policy or the planning process, it deals solely with engagement.</p> <p>Para 3.30 – 3.34 covers pre-application advice and encourages early engagement with the local community and key stakeholders.</p> <p>Comments on policy matters are not dealt with in the SCI.</p> <p>Details on enforcement are covered in an enforcement statement and do form part of the SCI. Carrying out development without planning permission includes breaches of planning permission – or not building in accordance with</p>	

Name/ Organisation/ Comment ID	Comment Summary	Officer Response	Proposed Modification (if any)
		approved plans. This would be investigated in line with our enforcement statement.	
ID: 175228434	How will the Council ensure that local facilities agreed for large developments are provided before building commences?	We work with developers and communities throughout the planning process to ensure infrastructure is appropriately implemented.	
ID: 175340758	Aspirations are to be welcomed. However, the SCI will only meet needs of citizens with disabilities with explicit commitments to and implementation of particular technologies/ measures.	Noted. We provide documents in accessible formats and we aim to make more use of technology to reach a wider audience.	
ID: 175795051	Only include information that is relevant - executive summary of major details and actions that people will need to take/what they need to look out for.	We have, as concisely as possible, provided all the information needed and have used diagrams and other graphical design to make this user-friendly.	
ID: 175817477	<p>For 'Major' applications, homes and businesses opposite and near to proposed access points should be consulted</p> <p>Neighbourhood Forums should be listed as a consultee as they are not town/parish councils.</p> <p>Conservation Officer should be consulted if impact on heritage asset. County Highways Officer should be consulted if parking falls below standard.</p> <p>Hyperlink missing for email alerts</p> <p>Press Notice – The use of newspaper seems contradictory to SODC's approach of modern</p>	<p>Site notices are posted for major applications and where appropriate a wider catchment is notified by letter or email. This is set out on p28</p> <p>Neighbourhood forums are not classed as statutory consultees, this is defined in legislation</p> <p>This would be the case</p> <p>This would be the case</p> <p>Noted and amended.</p> <p>Press notices are just one method.</p>	<p>Check all hyperlinks Amend Point 6 under paragraph 3.4 to refer to the respective constitutions of the councils.</p> <p>Add in the hyperlink to sign up for email alerts.</p>

Name/ Organisation/ Comment ID	Comment Summary	Officer Response	Proposed Modification (if any)
	<p>technology. No mention of how they publish in areas where there is not a local newspaper.</p> <p>Is it possible for residents to receive a copy of the weekly?</p> <p>Typo – consutlation</p> <p>This appears to give Council considerable freedom to close off engagement with the public. Needs explaining/examples /full transparency.</p> <p>Page 32, Paragraph 3.9 The link only goes to VOWH planning map – SODC map link needed.</p> <p>Page 34, Paragraph 3.10 • This is contradictory "minimum of 21 days to comment" then "comments... within 21 days".</p> <p>"21 days from the date of our notification letter" needs explaining. Is it 21 days from the day it is printed?</p> <p>Areas with made NDPs need to be informed a pre-application discussion has been held regarding specific sites.</p>	<p>The list is published on our website and emailed to councillors.</p> <p>Noted and amended</p> <p>Noted – consider amending the wording to explain that notification is given but no public consultation period for permitted development proposals.</p> <p>Noted and amended.</p> <p>Noted we will amend to make clear</p> <p>21 days from when the notice is displayed</p> <p>Information provided as part of a pre-application advice request is treated as confidential until a related formal planning application is received. Once received all information relating to the pre-application request and our response will be made public. We encourage early engagement with local communities.</p>	<p>Correct 'consultation' typo Para 3.5.</p> <p>Add link to SODC map too.</p>
ID: 176530958	Process very clear. Does not encourage people that their views will be taken into account - sounds like a	Noted. We consider a number of factors in progressing with policy documents and determining	

Name/ Organisation/ Comment ID	Comment Summary	Officer Response	Proposed Modification (if any)
	high-level process that small comments will have little effect on without coordination.	applications. Consultation is one of the key factors: we read all responses to consultations and give them careful consideration.	
ID: 176737883	<p>There have been delays between the date an application is allocated to a planning officer and it being publicised on the council's online application register for public comment reducing the time for interested parties to comment.</p> <p>Consider automatically notifying when new or amended documents are uploaded.</p>	<p>Noted this will be passed on to the relevant team</p> <p>Step 5 on p27 states "if an application is formally amended to address any planning issues raised, we may consult again if we think the changes may affect different neighbours or if new issues might be raised".</p>	
ID: 176744593	<p>See previous comments.</p> <p>Public meeting was a tick box exercise.</p>	Meetings are one of the ways we engage.	
ID: 176747450	<p>Easy to understand but concern over process. E.g. if a case officer has come to conclusion on something there is not opportunity to scrutinise this decision</p> <p>Could be clearer on when the deadline on consultations can be extended.</p>	<p>Case officers carefully consider all comments before making a recommendation to approve or refuse.</p> <p>This is done on a case by case basis</p>	
ID: 176864529	<p>Section 3 is generally very helpful. Parish Councils are not statutory consultees. this section, together with planning law are sufficient basis for parish to discharge their function.</p> <p>Parish could/should have key role in dealing with local concerns in relation to major developments. Could para 3.11 be amended to show that help may be available in these limited circumstances. E.g. 'Where a major development is likely to have a major impact on a locality or community we will endeavour to</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted, we will consider adding some additional text</p>	

Name/ Organisation/ Comment ID	Comment Summary	Officer Response	Proposed Modification (if any)
	nominate a liaison officer to assist locally elected groups such as PCs aimed at assisting them, in the interpretation of planning law and council policy, to deal with local concerns		
ID: 176920974	<p>Indication of the criteria on size/location that will cause a planning application to go to committee or require a site visit.</p> <p>Further details on the process by which local priorities will be identified and the community consulted in relation to drawing up S106 agreements.</p> <p>When developers seek pre-application advice, is there a standard practice on the response, and will the Vale facilitate community involvement on any pre-application advice sought?</p>	<p>The criteria which cause a planning application to go to planning committee can be found in the councils' Constitution.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.28 provides appropriate guidance on this.</p> <p>As noted in the SCI, further information regarding the pre-application advice process is given on the councils' websites. We encourage early engagement with the local community.</p>	
ID: 176918135	<p>Would be helpful if the Weekly List could be e-mailed to registered individuals, such as the Society's Planning Field Officers who each cover several parishes in the Chilterns part of South Oxfordshire</p> <p>Where the Chiltern Society comments on planning applications, comments need to be shown to be from the Society and not just the named individual making the comment.</p>	<p>The weekly list is published on the websites. We will make it easier to find.</p> <p>Noted. We will pass this on</p>	
ID: 175704669	Presented in a simple and easy to understand way The classification of Major and Minor applications based on size of development seems to be routinely ignored.	The classification of development is set nationally	

Name/ Organisation/ Comment ID	Comment Summary	Officer Response	Proposed Modification (if any)
	<p>Local Plans stress that a 'high quality of design' is required for developments. By what measures are the 'quality of design' assessed?</p> <p>LPA does not ensure factors such as National Guidance, Local Plans, professional guidance etc. are considered</p> <p>Once a decision has been made, mainly based on delegated powers, there is no mechanism available to residents to challenge the 'soundness' of the decision before approval is given. Process is seriously flawed.</p>	<p>Proposals are assessed against local and national policy.</p> <p>We read and consider all comments carefully. Consultation is one factor to consider when assessing a proposal.</p> <p>Process is set in national legislation. There is no third party right to appeal.</p>	
ID: 176857965	Can't find any reference on website to the weekly list nor have we been made aware of its existence.	The weekly list can be found on the councils' websites at the following links: <a href="#">South</a> / <a href="#">Vale</a>	
ID: 177008678	<p>S106 Planning Obligations paragraph 3.28. Communities (especially those with NDPs) should have opportunity to contribute to preliminary discussions about planning conditions, S106 obligations and S278 Agreements. It is not acceptable for District and County officers to impose these conditions without involving the communities which will be affected.</p> <p>Pre-Application Advice: Paragraph 3.31: Local communities should have the opportunity to engage in this process (especially those with NDPs). Must be a real engagement in planning proposals from the beginning to ensure that local priorities and concerns are considered.</p>	<p>Paragraph 3.28 provides appropriate guidance On S106 agreements.</p> <p>Para 3.30 – 3.34 covers pre-application advice and encourages early engagement with the local community and key stakeholders.</p>	



Name/ Organisation/ Comment ID	Comment Summary	Officer Response	Proposed Modification (if any)
	Planning officers should expect to engage with local parish councils.		
ID: 177039688	A very useful and well-presented summary of the planning application process.	Noted.	

**Q4. Overall, to what extent do you agree that the processes set out in the SCI will enable communities to be informed and have timely and meaningful opportunities to have a say on any planning proposals we make?**

Name/ Organisation/ Comment ID	Comment Summary	Officer Response	Proposed Modification (if any)
ID: 174154598	Local views are almost never listened to if they don't agree with what you want to do. You do it as a regulatory exercise that is not expected to make a difference in how you do it or the wanted outcome.	The councils carefully consider all comments submitted on plan-making and planning applications	
ID: 174154576	I know that comments need to be relevant to Planning policies etc, or they may get ignored. Is it worth highlighting this?	Noted. The councils' websites provide guidance on how to comment on a planning application effectively. See <a href="#">South</a> / <a href="#">Vale</a> . Reference could be made to these webpages in the SCI.	Add in links to the 'How to comment on a planning application effectively' pages of the websites.
ID: 174153472	Past experience has led to distrust of the Council and its long-worded commitments to community engagement.	The SCI is a statutory document	
ID: 174155654	Don't think so.	Noted.	

Name/ Organisation/ Comment ID	Comment Summary	Officer Response	Proposed Modification (if any)
ID: 174158393	See previous response <b>(comments captured in section 3)</b>	Comments in Q3 noted.	
ID: 174159092	If you keep to the statements made and respect all comments.	Noted.	
ID: 174159838	Potentially. Depends whether their views will actually be taken into account; no amount of time helps if it makes no difference.	Noted, we read all responses to consultations and give them careful consideration.	
ID: 174161555	Make it highly visible to seek input and use questionnaires etc. that are: 1. NOT slanted towards particular outcomes. 2. NOT overly simplistic (like this one). 3. Comprehensive (i.e. do NOT make enquiry into only certain aspects of a planning proposal that are then used to suggest a level of consultation that has not actually occurred.) 4. reported on comprehensively and clearly and NOT selectively/ opaquely. 5. enquired and reported on in the simplest language possible.	There is a balance between providing all the information that we need to so that people are informed, and trying to keep the document short. We have tried to get the balance right and do not want to omit information that may be useful. A consultation statement is prepared after formal consultations that sets out how engagement was undertaken, what the responses were and how the responses have been considered.	
ID: 174167953	No confidence that anything I say, in this survey or as part of the feedback process on planning, will be read let alone acted upon.	Noted, the councils consider all comments submitted on plan-making and planning applications.	
ID: 174160763	Parish councils are an underutilised means of engaging communities. Zoom meetings have enabled people to attend PC meetings remotely and hear what decisions are being made, even if we are not allowed to take part in the discussion.	Noted and agree use of virtual meetings has been a benefit	
ID: 174180415	Don't see how the document differs from existing practice.	Noted.	

Name/ Organisation/ Comment ID	Comment Summary	Officer Response	Proposed Modification (if any)
ID: 174182653	A stage needs to be added before/ after Reg 19 to demonstrate that you intend to take notice of community views. The diagrams are inconsistent with the explanatory text.	Comments made at Regulation 19 stage are sent to the examiner, any changes made to the plan must be done through the examination process. The diagram shows the key stages and focuses on the statutory requirements for plan making.	
ID: 174191829	Communities and Individuals should be notified as soon as there is an outline plan - before planning applications are formally submitted. It often seems that, once a formal planning application is submitted, there is little likelihood of it not going ahead, despite objections from Communities.	Para 3.30 – 3.34 covers pre-application advice and encourages early engagement with the local community and key stakeholders. Information provided as part of a pre-application advice request as confidential until such time that a related formal planning application is received. Once a formal planning application is received our response will be made public.	
ID: 174199579	We may have timely and meaningful opportunities to have a say, but all comments and genuine concerns are ignored.	Noted, the councils consider all comments submitted on plan-making and planning applications.	
ID: 174201658	The processes are straightforward, but it is difficult to overcome community apathy - until someone wants to build something next door. But the approach you are using is fair and will work.	Noted.	
ID: 174202530	I've no idea - the document manages to be very clear, and also leave me with no greater feel for what it means for me.	Noted.	
ID: 174217905	No differences between the plan and what currently happens.	Noted.	
ID: 174229530	No comments.	Noted.	
ID: 174357995	Will depend on how the consultation is undertaken. E.g., for planning applications there is never feedback	We receive a high volume of correspondence and are unable to respond to individual comments that we receive during a particular consultation. The	

Name/ Organisation/ Comment ID	Comment Summary	Officer Response	Proposed Modification (if any)
	<p>so it is difficult to know if comments have been taken into account etc.</p> <p>Most consultation processes do not appear to be a dialogue rather a process of write your comments and we may or may not take them into account. It is not possible to speak to planners. For effective consultation planners need to be resourced and have processes to enter into dialogs with consultees.</p>	<p>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. The councils consider all comments submitted on plan-making and planning applications.</p> <p>The councils carefully consider all comments submitted on planning policy documents and planning applications and take these into account alongside national and local policies when making decisions.</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>	
ID: 174420959	The SCI makes general positive comments but it's how these are implemented that will decide whether it enables communities to be informed and have timely and meaningful opportunities to have a say on any planning proposals	Noted.	
ID: 174424762	Stronger local democracy could be achieved through mini referendums.	This would be contrary to national policy	
ID: 174573133	Having a say is one thing. Listening and acting on what the community wants is another.	Noted, the councils consider all comments submitted on plan-making and planning applications.	

Name/ Organisation/ Comment ID	Comment Summary	Officer Response	Proposed Modification (if any)
ID: 174618685	<p>Doubt communities can have meaningful opportunities to have a say, given the extent to which the government interferes with the process.</p> <p>Doubts about pre-planning advice since the process seems to lack dialogue with the public. Pre-planning advice needs to identify all planning issues which may impact on the neighbourhood, the town or village, etc. It can only do this if the public is aware that advice is being sought.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Para 3.30 – 3.34 covers pre-application advice and encourages early engagement with the local community and key stakeholders.</p>	
ID: 174724350	<p>Planning process is biased towards developers. SCI designed to pretend that residents have a say when the reality is that their views are ignored.</p> <p>Most planning committee members don't have local knowledge</p> <p>Objectors are limited to a pitiful amount of time to present arguments while Officers are granted unlimited time.</p> <p>Once planning permission has been granted, the ground is 'broken' and then no more work needs to be done. Housing shortage is deliberately maintained - no new houses are built – the shortage can then be used to press the case for another development.</p> <p>Planning regulations are seldom enforced, and Section 106 money is often never forthcoming.</p>	<p>We consider a number of factors in progressing with policy documents and determining applications. Consultation is one of the key factors: we read all responses to consultations and give them careful consideration.</p> <p>The councils' constitutions address matters of process regarding planning committees. This is not addressed by the SCI.</p> <p>The SCI cannot deal with policy issues</p>	

Name/ Organisation/ Comment ID	Comment Summary	Officer Response	Proposed Modification (if any)
		Please see our websites for information on CIL monies	
ID: 174886382	There is no faith that what communities want or say will make much difference. We try to convince people otherwise but it's a major uphill battle.	Noted.	
ID: 175093121	Those who register to be notified of planning applications have a wider sphere of interest than just their postcode. I think 500m radius minimum.	We also publish a weekly of applications that can be viewed on our websites	
ID: 175102902	Please see previous comments.	Comments noted in response to earlier questions.	
ID: 175210775	Only if you connect with at least 50% of the community.	That would be contrary to national policy	
ID: 175314624	Lacks active feedback for Major Applications. Attended Public consultation for Valley Park years ago but none of the feedback seems to have made it to the plans. Planners need to develop a list of lessons learnt and implement them into future applications. There is no feedback process for volunteered community comments.	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.	
ID: 175340758	All public meetings must be held at venues with step free access and any ramps or lifts must comply with the relevant standard. The seating arrangements at public meetings must be flexible enough to incorporate spaces for those with disabilities, such as wheelchair users and their carers, which provide them with the ability to sit where, they wish to, rather than where they are put. A wheelchair accessible WC must be available.	Noted	

Name/ Organisation/ Comment ID	Comment Summary	Officer Response	Proposed Modification (if any)
ID: 175358522	Not sure how this SCI is different to the current one. Large sections of the public are excluded with the way we do things, unsure what we've changed to improve that.	Noted.	
ID: 175722188	Is 3.17 (time limit on speaking at committee) standard practice regardless of the size of development?	The councils' constitutions address matters of process regarding planning committees. This is not addressed by the SCI.	
ID: 175795051	42-page PDF is too long for most people. A 2-page summary of the main points will be much more helpful.	Noted – the document does contain a lot of information. There is a balance between providing all the information that we need to so that people are informed, and trying to keep the document short. We have tried to get the balance right and do not want to omit information that may be useful.	
ID: 175966398	Community involvement is very internet based and will miss residents who do not use/ have access to the internet.	Site notices and letters are used to notify those who are likely to be directly affected by a proposal.	
ID: 176389843	The theory is fine but much of it cannot be carried out in practice (see answer to q1). <b>(comments captured in Q1 summary)</b>	Noted.	
ID: 176530958	Given the legal requirements it is probably as good as it gets. Harder to say that it gives meaningful opportunities, although I expect it depends on the type of application and the position of the person giving comments.	The councils carefully consider all comments submitted on planning policy documents and planning applications and take these into account alongside national and local policies when making decisions.	
ID: 176623728	No change to the current system.	Noted.	

Name/ Organisation/ Comment ID	Comment Summary	Officer Response	Proposed Modification (if any)
ID: 176737883	<p>Paragraph 3.10 There have been delays between the date an application is allocated to a planning officer and it being publicised on the council's online application register for public comment reducing the time for interested parties to comment.</p> <p>Consider automatically notifying when new or amended documents are uploaded.</p>	<p>Noted this will be passed on to the relevant team</p> <p>Step 5 on p27 states "if an application is formally amended to address any planning issues raised, we may consult again if we think the changes may affect different neighbours or if new issues might be raised".</p>	
ID: 176744593	change of culture in the planning department needs to take place. Words and objectives set are not worth the paper they are written on if the people in the departments concerned don't believe in your goals.	This SCI sets out the statutory process for assessing planning applications and preparing plan making documents, which are then followed by the councils.	
ID: 176747450	Be more clear and specific about how policy is consulted, the methods employed, the specific timescales and where these will be found on the Council website.	We have tried to provide enough information to keep people informed about how we will consult on planning policy (section 2) and planning applications (section 3) in a concise way so that the document is not too long and is easy to read.	
ID: 176864529	The SCI could support South and Vale and parish/town councils in explaining the rationale and law behind applications thus removing the potential for ill-informed rancour that often surrounds applications.	Noted	
ID: 176920974	Processes of providing information on planning applications and enabling comments are good. Public understanding of the decision-making process, and consideration given to various plans needs to be addressed more clearly.	<p>Noted. The SCI deals with engagement and not the planning process</p> <p>More detail will be added on forums.</p>	



Name/ Organisation/ Comment ID	Comment Summary	Officer Response	Proposed Modification (if any)
	Document preparation would benefit from formally documented public/ local representation at the pre-drafting stage.  The Authority Monitoring Report is useful and we would welcome a higher profile to its publication.	The AMR is published on our websites	
ID: 176916499	The Planning and Development Committee are gravely concerned at the Council's inability to defend the Local Plan.	This does not relate to the SCI	
ID: 176942204	Minimum area of neighbourhood notification should be appropriate to rural locations where houses can be further apart.	Noted	
ID: 175704669	LPA is approving development that is contrary to policies in the local plans, that has an adverse effect on the local environment and those who live and work here. Unacceptable that the LPA 'cannot answer questions on individual applications because there are too many applications to deal with' when approvals are destroying the credibility of the LPA.  No mechanism available to residents to challenge conclusions expressed in Delegated and Committee reports where they are less than complete or inaccurate, before applications are approved.	We determine applications in accordance with local and national policy.  We cannot respond to individual comments on applications due to the high number of comments that we receive. We summarise and address comments in the delegated or committee report.  Noted, reports are published with the decision or ahead of the committee meeting.	
ID: 177003949	Be more clear and specific about how policy is consulted, the methods employed, the specific timescales and where these will be found on the Council website.	We have tried to provide enough information to keep people informed about how we will consult on planning policy (section 2) and planning applications (section 3) in a concise way so that the document is not too long and is easy to read.	

Name/ Organisation/ Comment ID	Comment Summary	Officer Response	Proposed Modification (if any)
ID: 176857965	<p>If the proposals in the recent White Paper go ahead, this section will be largely irrelevant.</p> <p>The 3-minute time-limit for public comments at Planning Committee meetings is very restrictive.</p> <p>Perception that the operation of the planning system is weighted in favour of developers, and against local residents/ other interested third parties. Through pre-application discussions, the developer has opportunities to persuade planning officers to see things the applicant's way.</p> <p>The SCI should do whatever it can to redress this perception of imbalance and unfairness. This could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- greater willingness of planning officers to engage with third parties - not just with the developer - before an application goes forward for decision</li> <li>- better opportunities for third parties to make their case at committee meetings. Include an opportunity for third parties to respond to points made to the committee by the applicant in their remarks.</li> <li>- possibly taking more items to committee, so that councillors get a better sense of how the system is actually working.</li> </ul>	<p>The SCI does not go into detail on the proposed changes to the planning system. The SCI will be reviewed and updated if there are significant changes to how we consult in the future.</p> <p>The councils' constitutions address matters of process regarding planning committees. This is not addressed by the SCI.</p> <p>The councils carefully consider all comments submitted on planning applications and take these into account alongside national and local policies when making decisions. We consider it appropriate that the pre-application advice given is disclosed when the application is formally submitted.</p> <p>The SCI sets out how we engage with local communities (local residents, businesses, organisations and statutory consultees). The councils' constitutions address matters of process regarding planning committees. This is not addressed by the SCI.</p>	
ID: 177008678	The need for further meaningful involvement is set out in Q3 above. <b>(comments captured in response to section 3)</b>	Comments noted under Q3.	

Name/ Organisation/ Comment ID	Comment Summary	Officer Response	Proposed Modification (if any)
ID: 177039688	It is imperative that there is a robust system in place for encouraging communities, both organisations and individuals, to engage with, and participate in, consultations.	The SCI sets out how the councils will engage with the local community on planning documents and planning applications.	

**Q5. Do you have any comments on the general format of our draft SCI? Is it clear and suitable for your needs?**

Name/ Organisation/ Comment ID	Comment Summary	Officer Response	Proposed Modification (if any)
ID: 174154598	Fine, easy to read and understand. A little patronising but does the job.	Noted	
ID: 174153472	Too long. Makes work for more council employees to work towards and around. Not worth the paper it is written on without real commitment and action to engage.	We have, as concisely as possible, provided all the information needed and have used diagrams and flow charts to supplement the text to make this user-friendly	
ID: 174154276	Yes it was all very clear.	Noted	
ID: 174155654	No - who is going to take on board what I say, thousands of people objected to the building at Iffley who took any notice you went and passed it anyway.	This comment appears to relate to a planning application in Oxford City.	
ID: 174159838	Too long. Diagrams & flow chart are most useful aspect for most. Public will feel disengaged when presented with 42 pages of process detail.	Noted. We have, as concisely as possible, provided all the information needed and have used diagrams and flow charts to supplement the text to make this user-friendly	
ID: 174161555	No comments	Noted	

Name/ Organisation/ Comment ID	Comment Summary	Officer Response	Proposed Modification (if any)
ID: 174167724	Presented in an easily legible format and is accompanied by clear flow charts.	Noted	
ID: 174167953	No	Noted	
ID: 174160763	Reads like a paper to committee. Where is community? Where is involvement?	We have tried to wrote this document in an easy to understand way, using flow charts and diagrams to supplement the text.	
ID: 174182653	The format is clear and language generally easy to understand.  Where actions for different documents will be the same the explanations and lists of actions could be combined to make the document more concise.	Noted – we will consider whether information could be combined to make the document more concise.	
ID: 174184980	Too many words. Too much process.	Noted. We have, as concisely as possible, provided all the information needed and have used diagrams and flow charts to supplement the text to make this user-friendly	
ID: 174191829	Very clear. Words and diagrams stating the same information, means it should be clear to all, and clear, concise language is used throughout.	Noted	
ID: 174199579	Clear and easy to read.	Noted	
ID: 174202530	Appreciate the desire for making things clear and explaining them.  Would suggest that the whole document needs a rethink. Who is the target audience? Rather than explaining the council to them, what are the key interacting points that they can access, and then work	The target audience is a range of people – local residents, businesses, organisations, town and parish councillors.	

Name/ Organisation/ Comment ID	Comment Summary	Officer Response	Proposed Modification (if any)
	from them to the detail, rather than working from the detail to the (hard to identify) access points. Start with a clear flow for each section, and then expand.		
ID: 174203774	It's fine and clear.	Noted	
ID: 174210371	Very wordy; but clearly laid out and entirely understandable.	Noted	
ID: 174215338	Concern is that community involvement is just another box to be ticked, and comments made do not materially change anything, such that an answer is given to the commentator which justifies why the proposals should go forward, with no amendment made, or with a reply that details will be dealt with at a later stage.	The council has to consider a number of factors in determining applications. Consultation is one of the key factors: the council reads all responses to consultations and gives them careful consideration. In some cases details may be dealt with by a planning condition, or if the application is at an outline stage, the details will be dealt with by way of a reserved matters planning application.	
ID: 174217905	Flowcharts are very helpful.	Noted.	
ID: 174221903	Very clear & straight forward. Filling out the questionnaire online works well with clear options that work.	Noted.	
ID: 174229530	No comments.	Noted	
ID: 174357995	Format is clear and well presented.	Noted	
ID: 174466189	Clearly presented.	Noted	

Name/ Organisation/ Comment ID	Comment Summary	Officer Response	Proposed Modification (if any)
ID: 174473787	It's a bit of management speak.	We have tried to write this document in an easy to understand way, using flow charts and diagrams to supplement the text.	
ID: 174573133	Too long and wordy.	Noted. We have, as concisely as possible, provided all the information needed and have used diagrams and flow charts to supplement the text	
ID: 174618685	No	Noted	
ID: 174724350	A complete waste of time.	Noted	
ID: 174852486	Too long.	Noted. We have, as concisely as possible, provided all the information needed and have used diagrams and flow charts to supplement the text	
ID: 174886382	Too long and complex for most people to take in/ want to take in.  People want to see real benefit of getting engaged with planning. Believe this is still too complex and process driven a document to break through the general sense of malaise.	Noted. We have, as concisely as possible, provided all the information needed and have used diagrams and flow charts to supplement the text	
ID: 175093121	Have frequently searched the planning system. For large developments that have multiple entries it is difficult to see which is the relevant set of docs and what they're covering. A simple summary of the specific application and better named documents may help.	Noted. This comment relates to how subsequent planning applications are referenced and then searched for on the website.	
ID: 175102902	Presentation is clear and easy to read and understand.	Noted	

Name/ Organisation/ Comment ID	Comment Summary	Officer Response	Proposed Modification (if any)
ID: 175210775	Most people will not be interested and thus will not understand or appreciate what is going on.	We have tried to write the document in an easy to understand way and used diagrams to supplement the text, making it easier to pick out the key points.	
ID: 175314624	If followed, should be an improvement. More active approach for comments/ lessons learnt on major plans (evidence gathering & engagement); better feedback when/if changes implemented. Plans will need to be presented so that Residents can understand, all applications require too much skill to interpret for the average member of the Community.	We recognise that some plans are detailed and contain a lot of information. Please contact our Customer Services Team by telephone (01235 422600) if you need help interpreting specific plans on an application we are dealing with.	
ID: 175340758	<p>Zoom was probably the preferred software for virtual meetings and that good practice would be to make slides and other images available in large format in advance.</p> <p>Respondent (Oxfordshire Association for the Blind) provided detailed advice on best practice.</p> <p>PDF file that contains the SCI is not fully accessible to screen readers and fails some of the standard tests for PDF accessibility.</p> <p>Document is good at describing what stages there are to planning processes. While it frequently mentions digital technology, it is not particularly clear on the 'how' of community consultation or the way that consultation will be implemented.</p> <p>Need to consider exclusion of those groups who do not have the technology to access consultations/ documents.</p> <p>We do not know what font size site notices are in and we would ask these questions to be referred on to development control.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Our communications officer will make contact about this issue. We are committed to making sure all our document are fully accessible.</p> <p>We will continue to explore new digital ways on engaging and will use a variety of methods to ensure we reach as many people as possible.</p> <p>Noted.</p>	

Name/ Organisation/ Comment ID	Comment Summary	Officer Response	Proposed Modification (if any)
		Noted.	
ID: 175358522	Clear document - easy to read. Could be more concise.	Noted	
ID: 175795051	See my previous comments. <b>(comments captured in earlier Qs)</b>	Noted	
ID: 175817477	A great improvement from the previous version and is easy to read / understand.	Noted	
ID: 176066830	Really easy to follow.	Noted	
ID: 176287108	Not enough proactive community interaction on specific issues for that community. Interaction should be earlier in the process. There should be a period added to identify the key stakeholders and their weighting on the decision-making process.	We engage at each formal stage of the process. We also identify and consult key stakeholders. We do not weight the influence of stakeholders, a balance must be made on a case by case basis.	
ID: 176324517	Quite wordy but the direction of travel is good.	Noted	
ID: 176530958	Stimulating meaningful community involvement is difficult, particularly in Didcot when discussions regarding the Garden Town have resulted in little local visible effect. Some plans which have easy to see effects would be helpful.	Your comments about Didcot are noted. The SCI does not deal with policy matters.	
ID: 176737883	Clearly set out.	Noted	
ID: 176744593	Please see previous comments. <b>(comments captured in earlier Qs)</b>	We have to consider a number of factors in progressing with policy documents and determining	



Name/ Organisation/ Comment ID	Comment Summary	Officer Response	Proposed Modification (if any)
	Needs to be openness, transparency and honesty in all that goes on (currently not the case). I know there is huge political pressure to build and generate income for LA's that have many financial pressures. Local views, despite the Localism Act are always bottom of the pile, last to be considered and carry the least weight.	applications. Consultation is one of the key factors: we read all responses to consultations and give them careful consideration.	
ID: 176747450	Summary/appendix at the end with key points of how the public can engage and find documentation, consultations etc. would be helpful.	The SCI contains tables that summarise this information including how to respond to consultations.	Add tables and diagrams to contents list for ease of reference
ID: 176920974	Summary poster/ leaflets of key points, relevant plans, what is changing and the relationship between documents would be useful as many of the groups that the council is trying to reach could be put off by a 40 page document. Survey concentrated heavily on whether the document is understandable, we suggest that there is scope for some specific questions beyond those on clarity.	The SCI contains tables that summarise this information including how to respond to consultations.  Noted, we will consider this for future consultations	Add tables and diagrams to contents list for ease of reference
ID: 176918135	Very clear and easy to read.	Noted	
ID: 176942204	Clear and understandable.	Noted	
ID: 175704669	Format is generally good. By explaining how Officers go about the assessment of planning applications - who does what and how weighting of Local Plan policies is brought into the development of	There is no set weighting of policies. Each planning decision has a report that sets out which policies are considered and explains how a decision has been reached.	

Name/ Organisation/ Comment ID	Comment Summary	Officer Response	Proposed Modification (if any)
	conclusions, and how consistency and balance are achieved, the process would be clearer to communities and residents (who are not planning experts).		
ID: 177003949	Summary/appendix with the key points of how the public can engage and find documentation, consultations etc. would be helpful.  Details of how to join the online planning meetings would be useful.	The SCI contains tables that summarise this information including how to respond to consultations.  Noted. This can be found on the councils' websites.	Add tables and diagrams to contents list for ease of reference
ID: 176857965	Clearly presented but a bit short and "high-level". Needs more flesh to demonstrate that you are serious about effective and early engagement and to show people how they can get involved.	Noted. We have tried to be concise to avoid a long document that may be off putting to read.	
ID: 177008678	No further comments.	Noted	
ID: 177039688	Clear, concise, and well presented.	Noted	

**Q6. Do you have any other comments on our draft SCI?**

Name/ Organisation/ Comment ID	Comment Summary	Officer Response	Proposed Modification (if any)
ID: 174154598	No	Noted	
ID: 174154576	Seems very "involving" for ordinary members of the public, but people do not always understand that their	The SCI refers to material planning considerations and provides a link to our websites to find out more	

Name/ Organisation/ Comment ID	Comment Summary	Officer Response	Proposed Modification (if any)
	<p>comments need to be relevant to Planning policies etc,</p> <p>Residents may get frustrated if their comments are ignored because they are not relevant or are outside the scope of Planning policies etc. (gave example in full comment)</p>	information on what can and cannot be considered when determining a planning application.	
ID: 174154204	Very little is done to protect communities from large construction companies regarding the distress caused by their lorries driving through small towns and villages. This is usually illegal but as nobody monitors it, they do it anyway.	Noted, unfortunately this is an issue that is outside the remit of the SCI.	
ID: 174154276	Some information with housing needs, waiting lists within specific areas would assist those with the un-affordability within South Oxford whereby social housing can reduce social care should relatives of elderly locals needing care be required. Some housing will always be required.	These comments relate to housing affordability, social care and affordable housing provision. These issues are covered in other policy documents prepared by planning (the local plan) and by the Housing team.	
ID: 174161555	Refer back to the answer and comments given to Q4. (comments captured under Q4)	Noted	
ID: 174161312	Too much information for people who don't understand the planning process, e.g. acronyms. For many it is too lengthy to absorb.	Noted. We have, as concisely as possible, provided all the information needed and have used diagrams and flow charts to supplement the text. We have tried to avoid using acronyms and will check the document for them.	
ID: 174167953	No.	Noted	
ID: 174199579	Consult us all you like, but until you listen and pay proper attention to residents' concerns it's all lip service	The councils read all responses and give them careful consideration.	

Name/ Organisation/ Comment ID	Comment Summary	Officer Response	Proposed Modification (if any)
ID: 174201658	<p>Pandemic will exacerbate decline of town centres. Approach to planning and development could help to overcome many problems - empty shop fronts, declining business rate income for councils and the need for low cost housing for the younger generation.</p> <p>Consultation needs to be genuine and not paying lip-service to community involvement.</p> <p>Clear strategies for towns and villages are needed. This would be easier to show how developments comply with the agreed strategy.</p>	<p>This comment relates to matters outside the remit of the SCI.</p> <p>Local plans have an overall strategy, and sometimes more local strategies e.g. for the main towns. This is something we will consider when preparing the joint local plan.</p>	
ID: 174203774	No.	Noted	
ID: 174210371	No.	Noted	
ID: 174215338	Community involvement is just another box to be ticked, and comments made do not materially change proposals	We have to consider a number of factors in progressing with policy documents and determining applications. Consultation is one of the key factors: we read all responses to consultations and give them careful consideration.	
ID: 174217905	I missed a summary section on what is new compared to current practice.	Noted	
ID: 174229530	No comments.	Noted	
ID: 174160445	Would be helpful to give more detail about how outline planning applications are dealt with.	Applications for outline planning permission seek to establish whether the scale and nature of a proposed development would be acceptable to the local planning authority, before a fully detailed (reserved matters) proposal is put forward.	

Name/ Organisation/ Comment ID	Comment Summary	Officer Response	Proposed Modification (if any)
	<p>Para 3.32 of the SCI states that any pre-application advice letters between the applicant and the authority will be published. This should include minutes of any meetings too, including meetings with other authorities.</p> <p>The online SODC planning portal should be made more efficient and user-friendly. It is very slow and content is difficult to access.</p> <p>Planning committee members should be required to formally confirm that they have read and considered all comments submitted on an application before granting or denying planning permission.</p>	<p>Consultation on these types of applications is carried out in the same way as for full applications.</p> <p>Information provided as part of a pre-application advice request as confidential until such time that a related formal planning application is received. Once a formal planning application is received our response will be made public. We normally publish the meeting notes if they are produced instead of the letter, often a letter is done following the meeting(s).</p> <p>Noted. This comment will be passed on to the communications team.</p> <p>The process for committee meetings are set out in the councils constitutions rather than in the SCI.</p>	
ID: 174357995	Provides a good summary of the planning processes but doesn't understand/ recognise that for effective consultation a dialogue is needed between the parties. Comes across more of a box ticking exercise	We receive a high volume of correspondence and are unable to respond to individual comments that we receive during a particular consultation. We welcome opportunities for dialogue where appropriate.	
ID: 174249396	Not convinced it will alter how planning applications are considered as local comments seem to be ignored.	The councils will continue to read and give careful consideration to all comments received.	
ID: 174466189	The way in which the summary of results of any statutory public consultations will be reported and published is unclear in terms of the level of detail	The consultation statement will include the number of responses received to a consultation and where respondents could choose their level of agreement	

<b>Name/ Organisation/ Comment ID</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Officer Response</b>	<b>Proposed Modification (if any)</b>
	which will be published. These are vital to ensure a transparent process	to a statement a breakdown will be provided. A summary of the all the comments will be provided and how we propose to respond to the comments.	
ID: 174573133	Primary development should be restricted to brownfield sites. Improving existing areas. Leave farm fields and nature alone.	The SCI itself is not a policy making document.	
ID: 174618685	No.	Noted	
ID: 174724350	It is a complete waste of time.	Noted	
ID: 174852486	Summarise the main bits. Who has time to review 42 pages and who is really concentrating after the first paragraph?	We have, as concisely as possible, provided all the information needed and have used diagrams and flow charts to supplement the text	
ID: 174886382	See the Thame Green Living Plan for an alternative approach.	Noted	
ID: 175228434	Will be irrelevant if it does not allow the local community to have genuinely meaningful input into the planning process. This must include the ability to prevent unwanted and unsustainable development by referendum/ some other means.	Referendums are held for neighbourhood plans but not for local plans or planning applications. This would be contrary to legislation and is not something the councils can undertake.	
ID: 175340758	OXTRAG would be happy to meet with you and your colleagues to discuss the issues if helpful.	Noted	
ID: 175358522	Mentions reaching those members of society who are 'seldom involved' but how? No detail on how you intend to enable the public better.	Noted, we will consider adding more about the methods used for engaging with seldom heard groups.	Add more detail on possible ways to engage eg forums

Name/ Organisation/ Comment ID	Comment Summary	Officer Response	Proposed Modification (if any)
ID: 175795051	Another example of redundant information for the reader/user - you have already asked this in the previous question.	Noted	
ID: 175817477	Page 39 (Glossary) Typo – 'omes'	Noted and corrected	Correct 'omes' typo on Page 39.
ID: 175966398	Community involvement is very internet based and will miss residents who do not use/ have access to the internet.	Site notices and letters are used to notify those who are likely to be directly affected by a proposal.	
ID: 176006820	Section 3.10: time given to respond to applications should be more than minimum 21 days. Suggest for major applications it should be 2 calendar months.	The consultation period of 21 days is set out in legislation.	
ID: 176324517	We have encountered significant delays re. certain action and decision making. Understand that these delays are driven by lack of resource in the relevant department.	Noted, we endeavour to respond within our stated timeframes.	
ID: 176389843	The concept of Community Involvement is irrelevant when set against the resources of developers.	The councils read and give careful consideration to all comments received.	
ID: 176623917	Good but too long for most people.	We have, as concisely as possible, provided all the information needed and have used diagrams and flow charts to supplement the text	
ID: 176623728	Consultation on planning applications is not transparent. Discussions take place prior to applications being made yet not with those people directly affected. large developments are not known about until an application is made. No evidence in the SCI that this is considered.	Pre-application discussions between the council and applicant are encouraged and have many <a href="#">benefits</a> . Information provided as part of a pre-application advice request is treated as confidential until a related formal planning application is received. Once our response will be made public.	
ID: 176737883	Paragraph 3.10 There have been delays between the date an application is allocated to a planning officer and it being publicised on the council's online application	Noted this will be passed on to the relevant team	

Name/ Organisation/ Comment ID	Comment Summary	Officer Response	Proposed Modification (if any)
	register for public comment reducing the time for interested parties to comment. Consider automatically notifying when new or amended documents are uploaded.	Step 5 on p27 states “if an application is formally amended to address any planning issues raised, we may consult again if we think the changes may affect different neighbours or if new issues might be raised”.	
ID: 176744593	Too much is discussed and decided behind closed doors. The general public have no confidence or belief that their voices will be heard and taken into account.	The councils’ constitutions set out how decisions are made and the procedures the councils follow to ensure that these are efficient, transparent and accountable to local people.	
ID: 176747450	No.	Noted	
ID: 176920974	Information on how internal consultation on planning is handled and reviewed would be useful to inform public engagement in the planning process.	Comments made on planning applications by other officers of the council are uploaded on to the website with all public comments.	
ID: 176916499	Digital consultation has limited the involvement of those without access to the internet.  Due to the temporary measures expiring on 31st December 2021, the Committee hope that paper documents are reintroduced, especially for larger applications which are difficult to interpret on a small screen	We will continue to use different methods, including digital to engage, recognising that this does not work for everyone and other methods will also be needed  Noted	
ID: 176918135	No further comments.	Noted	
ID: 176942204	Continue engaging local communities.	Noted	
ID: 175704669	See previous documentation.	Noted	



<b>Name/ Organisation/ Comment ID</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Officer Response</b>	<b>Proposed Modification (if any)</b>
ID: 176984903	Missed out the importance of encouraging developers to engage with local residents and businesses before they submit their application.	Para 3.30 – 3.34 covers pre-application advice and encourages early engagement with the local community and key stakeholders.	
ID: 176857965	<p>Would like the SCI to demonstrate commitment to using some of the more innovative forms of engagement and reaching out to a wider section of the community.</p> <p>The 2020 Corporate Plan commits you to “seek to ensure the creation of community liaison groups to form part of all early stages of development planning” this doesn’t appear in the draft SCI</p> <p>An example of good intent would have been to invite the community to engage with the SCI before it was drafted rather than presenting us with what looks like the finished article.</p>	<p>We are committed to reviewing our methods of engagement including the use of digital technologies.</p> <p>Noted, we will consider adding some additional text about the use of forums.</p> <p>We welcome feedback on the draft document and will take all comments into account and make necessary changes.</p>	Add text on forums
ID: 177008678	No.	Noted	
ID: 177039688	No.	Noted	
ID: 177045932	The email contains pages of detail about procedures, which must have taken hours of input into the system at considerable cost, but no details about the draft SCI. Could you not save much time and cost by providing these details for us to comment upon rather than doing a tick box exercise.	Unclear what this comment means	
ID: 177083289	(Generic email response from Marine Authority – no comments on the SCI)	Noted	

Name/ Organisation/ Comment ID	Comment Summary	Officer Response	Proposed Modification (if any)
ID: 177094503	South and Vale Council areas lie outside the defined coalfield and therefore the Coal Authority has no specific comments to make on your Local Plans / SPDs etc.	Noted	
ID: 177094866	National Highways has reviewed the consultation and have no comments	Noted	
ID: 177098423	<p>1.3 Both links are to the South corporate plan. No link to the Vale plan.</p> <p>1.6 TThe typo</p> <p>Be clear that paper copies will only be provided at specified locations, and paper will not otherwise be used. Suggest committing to making electronic access available at specified locations for use by people without internet access.</p> <p>Not clear why the sentence about focus groups. If they will be used, please be more precise.</p> <p>Status and role of databases needs better definition. If you ask to be added to the databases it is not clear what will happen, and on what you will be consulted. If you receive details of nearby planning application, the email has no link for unsubscribe, nor a link to update preferences.</p> <p>Does the legislation allow for a Development Plan to cover more than one District, or will there end up being two plans, prepared jointly?</p>	<p>Noted, link will be added</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>We are required in legislation to provide paper copies (when not covered by temporary measures). We are fully supportive of digital engagement and reducing paper use, but also need to consider the needs of those who cannot use the internet.</p> <p>Noted, we will add more text to explain focus groups</p> <p>Noted this will be passed on to the communications team</p> <p>Yes, legislation allows for plans to cover more than one district.</p>	<p>Add hyperlink to the Vale corporate plan. Correct 'The' typo</p>

Name/ Organisation/ Comment ID	Comment Summary	Officer Response	Proposed Modification (if any)
	<p>Diagram 1 after 2.7 More detail needed about how representations are reviewed and incorporated into the plan..</p> <p>2.12 The Vale link uses http: instead of https: Inconsistent terminology. Most of the rest of the document just refers to Vale and South. E.g. see 2.9</p> <p>Diagram 6 after 2.26 Muddled diagram - does not describe any hierarchy. Includes a cog for OX-CAM arch, which is not mentioned in the text.</p> <p>2.29 A link to the Duty to Cooperate would be useful along with a list of neighbouring councils</p> <p>2.29 "including neighbouring councils 1." This footnote link does not work</p> <p>2.29 accordsnce typo</p> <p>2.31-2.35 Repetition of consulting goals outlined in 1.16 – 1.9</p> <p>Table after 2.35 Please could all Tables be numbered.</p>	<p>The consultation statement will include the number of responses received to a consultation and where respondents could choose their level of agreement to a statement a breakdown will be provided. A summary of the all the comments will be provided and an officer response to the comments.</p> <p>Noted – we will consider removing this diagram as it is not best placed in the SCI.</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted, we will consider consolidating this text. Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>	<p>Consider adding neighbouring authorities as an appendix Fix hyperlink in footnote. Correct 'accordsnce' typo.</p>

Name/ Organisation/ Comment ID	Comment Summary	Officer Response	Proposed Modification (if any)
	<p>2.36 Preferring use of the online survey is often a means of restricting comment. Free format comment (such as this document) should be encouraged.</p> <p>2.39 should state the District Council's commitment to a detailed report at least every three months and not be satisfied with 'regularly publish'.</p> <p>3.3 'major', 'minor' and 'other' are categories of applications not types.</p> <p>Clarification needed as to which applications are for public consultation &amp; which ones are just for public information.</p> <p>Particularly useful would be details of the purpose of Scoping and Screening applications and what consultation is involved with these</p> <p>Email Alerts. The links for signing up for alerts do not work.</p> <p>3.5 Second table Statutory Bodies Suggest "the planning practice guidance" is expanded, to "the national planning practice guidance (NPPG)".</p> <p>3.5 Second table Town and Parish councils</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>AMR's are published annually</p> <p>Noted, we will amend this</p> <p>Noted. The SCI needs to cover local plan preparation and planning applications. Adding further detail would increase the length of the document</p> <p>This could be added to an appendix</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>	<p>Give all tables a table number.</p> <p>3.3: Change type to category</p> <p>Add links to sign up for planning alerts.</p>

Name/ Organisation/ Comment ID	Comment Summary	Officer Response	Proposed Modification (if any)
	<p>Clarify under what circumstances paper copies will be provided to Parish Councils.</p> <p>Table after 3.9 Middle paragraph starting “We provide guidance on how to comment on planning applications on our websites.” Implies that if amendments require another consultation, earlier comments are not considered/ need to be resubmitted.</p> <p>3.12-3.14 Needs something on how decisions are communicated where S106's are still to be agreed.</p> <p>3.15 Information provided in this paragraph is too 'thin'.</p> <p>3.17 Please bring Vale time limit of 3 mins in line with the 5 mins in South.</p> <p>3.23 &amp; 3.25 Links do not work (mailto:)</p> <p>3.28 We do not consult on Section 106 agreements. This is bad. 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.</p>	<p>Parish councils are not routinely provided with paper copies.</p> <p>In that table it states : “if an amendment is made to a current application, comments originally submitted are taken into account and do not need to be made again”</p> <p>Please refer to the relevant application on the website</p> <p>Further information on delegated powers and planning committees can be found on our websites and in the councils' constitutions</p> <p>Noted and passed on to democratic services. The process at planning committee is provided for in the councils' constitutions and cannot be amended through the SCI.</p> <p>Noted and amended</p>	<p>Consistently refer to the PPG as the national planning practice guidance. Fix the hyperlink if it is not working.</p> <p>Check all links</p>

Name/ Organisation/ Comment ID	Comment Summary	Officer Response	Proposed Modification (if any)
	<p>3.35 – 3.38 Monitoring and enforcement needed to make sure development is carried out in conformity with planning permission.</p> <p>Glossary Major Developments "Applications for developments of 10 or more omes, ....." should be "homes"</p> <p>Clarification is requested for each type of application listed on the search function about the consultation involved: Full consultation / information only / no notification For Statutory Bodies / Parish councils / General Public</p>	<p>Para 2.8 states that “we work with town and parish councils and local district councillors, to find out which community facilities may be impacted by new development or that require investment as a result of the development. Once we have a Section 106 agreement in place and the development has commenced, we will notify town and parish councils or parish meetings of the sums available for identified community facilities and provide an update to them on a six-monthly basis</p> <p>Carrying out development without planning permission includes breaches of planning permission – or not building in accordance with approved plans. This would be investigated in line with our enforcement statement. Details on enforcement are covered in an enforcement statement and do form part of the SCI</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>This would make the document longer and goes beyond what the SCI needs to cover</p>	<p>Fix hyperlinks in 3.23 and 3.25.</p> <p>Fix hyperlinks.</p> <p>Fix hyperlinks.</p> <p>Correct ‘omes’ typo</p>
ID: 177099691	Changes should be made to the designation of Minor for developments of up to 9 homes to be changed to Major in an AONB all three planning categories (Major/Minor and Other) to be considered as Major.	The categories of planning application (Major/minor) are prescribed by Government and cannot be changed through the SCI.	

Name/ Organisation/ Comment ID	Comment Summary	Officer Response	Proposed Modification (if any)
	<p>Do the planning authorities retain photographic dated records of a site notice?</p> <p>Minimum notification buffer: minimum range of 5 metres is inadequate and consideration should be given to properties outside this range but directly opposite the development site. Of particular concern is proposals in AONB</p> <p>Page 30 Permitted Development: Why are parish councils not notified of permitted development proposals?</p> <p>Page 33 Sect 3/10:- Current processing of applications does not always allow sufficient time for a parish council to meet . 21 days is not sufficient, site notices are hit and miss</p> <p>No mention of how to ensure a cohesive approach to infrastructure needs, the document does not present an opportunity to respond to the “wider picture” required for planning issues</p>	<p>A photo is taken of the site notice and kept on record.</p> <p>This sets out the minimum. Where proposal may directly affect we will consult more widely as our discretion.</p> <p>There is no opportunity to comment on permitted development proposal</p> <p>The 21 day period is set out in article 15 of the Town and County Planning (Development Management Procedure) Order</p> <p>Email alerts and the weekly list are useful tools for finding out about planning applications.</p> <p>The SCI sets out how we will engage with the local community on planning documents and planning applications. Expanding the document to cover more general planning matters would not be appropriate. How the councils will respond to planning issues will be covered in other planning documents such as the joint local plan.</p>	

Name/ Organisation/ Comment ID	Comment Summary	Officer Response	Proposed Modification (if any)
	<p>Planning application register for SODC: each planning application should be presented in a consistent and logical order/clearly labelled</p> <p>No means for public to access an “easy to read” annual report as to how the District Council has spent CIL monies.</p> <p>Concerns expressed at creation of a Joint Local Plan when the former only adopted its Local Plan for 2035 in December 2020. Also refer to the current consultations for the Oxford Plan 2050/Ox-Cam ARC/ the many Neighbourhood Plans being formed throughout Oxfordshire</p> <p>Parish councils would welcome an improved planning system with District authorities working to create an inclusive partnership - not the current negative environment</p> <p>Officers do not wish a parish council’s objection to realise an automatic referral to a planning committee -. A Parish council representative at such a meeting being restricted to 5 minutes to support the submitted objection but the applicant allowed 15 minutes to speak – all of which negates the endeavours undertaken by parish councils on behalf of local residents.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>See the councils’ websites for detail on how CIL monies are spent and recorded. This is covered in detail in the SCI.</p> <p>Noted, these comments do not relate specifically to the SCI</p> <p>Noted. These matters relate to the councils’ constitutions and are not in the remit of the SCI.</p>	
ID: 177101554		Note this comment is very long and detailed and has been heavily summarised where possible.	



Name/ Organisation/ Comment ID	Comment Summary	Officer Response	Proposed Modification (if any)
	<p>Need to have greater transparency for those decisions made about unauthorised development and be wary of officer delegation for such cases. Should be a referral to the Planning Committee. If reported to Planning Committee, time limit of 3 minutes is too short.</p> <p>5. Planning officers should be limited in use of delegated decision-making powers for amendments when decisions would normally be addressed during the main planning assessment. This should apply even when single third-party objections remain (currently allowed) under the scheme of delegation.</p> <p>Local research work should take place during the Local Plan work programme, starting from first principles, often poorly evidenced</p> <p>7. Citizens have the right to be informed about policy formulation in the Local Plan including its evidence.</p> <p>8. References for Urban Design guidelines and Building Design Guides must not exclude Building Services equipment.</p> <p>9. No reason why any development management guidelines and scheme of officer delegation should not be subject to public scrutiny prior to decisions about them and be regularly reviewed.</p>	<p>This is covered in an enforcement statement rather than in the SCI.</p> <p>If an amendment is made to a current application, comments originally submitted are taken into account and do not need to be made again</p> <p>The local plan is supported by a robust evidence base. This comment does not relate to the SCI Noted and agreed</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>This comment relates to the councils' constitutions</p>	

Name/ Organisation/ Comment ID	Comment Summary	Officer Response	Proposed Modification (if any)
ID: 177102219	<p>1. SODC's website application management system is deficient</p> <p>2.The process/management of land supply numbers has been inadequately managed/grossly mis-managed resulting in the loss of expensive planning appeals.</p> <p>3. The preparation for and presentation by 'experts' appointed and guided by SODC has been poor</p>	<p>Noted and comment passed on</p> <p>These comments relate to a specific site / case and not the SCI which deals with methods of consultation.</p>	
ID: 177102407	<p>Communications from the LPA are often unclear and assume a level of knowledge not commonly available to residents. This statement should make clear how this issue will be resolved. E.g. this document assumes that everyone knows what a 'joint local plan' is. Does this mean that housing needs for the two separate districts will be combined or met separately?</p> <p>Paragraph 1.6: What feedback will be given to those submitting comments in this consultation? How will we know if any notice is taken of the comments?</p> <p>Paragraph 1.15 &amp; Paragraph 1.16</p>	<p>A glossary is included to help explain technical terms.</p> <p>Housing Needs will be dealt with through the joint local plan and is not covered in the SCI.</p> <p>A consultation statement is prepared after formal consultations that sets out how engagement was undertaken, what the responses were and how the responses have been considered. The consultation statement will include the number of responses received to a consultation and where respondents could choose their level of agreement to a statement a breakdown will be provided. A summary of the all the comments will be provided and how we propose to respond to the comments.</p>	

Name/ Organisation/ Comment ID	Comment Summary	Officer Response	Proposed Modification (if any)
	<p>Many residents do not go to libraries nor pass community notice boards so it is important that information which affects residents is still delivered to their homes.</p> <p>Can you provide a list of “deposit locations”?</p> <p>It should still be possible to sign up for consultations and be communicated with by mail (post).</p> <p>Involvement seems to mean submitting comments which the council may ignore.</p> <p>There is no explanation of how the community can get involved in decisions about how CIL funds are spent.</p> <p>No mention made of Oxfordshire Growth Needs Assessment</p>	<p>We use several methods to communicate with residents and are always looking to improve. We are also trying to reduce paper use where possible.</p> <p>There is no definitive list of “deposit locations”, though these are typically libraries within the district and sometimes other public buildings. The location and number of deposit locations will depend on the type of document/s being consulted on and where it is appropriate to make copies available.</p> <p>Where possible we are trying to reduce paper usage. If a residents cannot access the internet or emails we will send a letter to notify them of consultations.</p> <p>The councils read all responses to consultations and gives them careful consideration. The councils have to consider a number of factors in progressing with policy documents and determining applications. Consultation is one of the key factors</p> <p>Further details about how CIL monies are allocated and reported on can be found on the councils’ websites.</p> <p>This is not an issue to be considered in the SCI. This will be considered as part of the Oxfordshire Plan and local plans.</p>	

Name/ Organisation/ Comment ID	Comment Summary	Officer Response	Proposed Modification (if any)
	<p>Unclear how residents register their interest except by providing an email online. How can residents asked to be contacted by post?</p> <p>Diagram in paragraph 2.35 states “we may consult consultees that are registered on our general consultation database if we think they may have an interest in the consultation” who makes the decision that they have an interest and on what basis is this decision made?</p> <p>Table in paragraph 3.4 should be expanded to include a paragraph in step 2 stating that neighbouring households can contact their District Councillor with any concerns/questions.</p> <p>Table in paragraph 3.4 should be expanded to include the fact that the application can go to committee if there are material planning reasons. A list of what constitutes material planning reasons would be useful.</p> <p>16) Diagram in paragraph 3.5: “If you’re interested in planning applications in your area (postcode), you can sign up for email alerts” this does not meet the aims in Paragraph 1.13. It should still be possible to sign up for alerts and be communicated with by mail.</p> <p>If there will be significant traffic impact, a large building or a major development, shouldn’t the consultation be wider?</p>	<p>Please call the planning service number 01235 422425.</p> <p>It will depend on the type of planning document being consulted on and the scope of that document. Officers will take a view.</p> <p>This is not considered necessary.</p> <p>This is included in the table on p32 with a link to the website for further information.</p> <p>The councils are trying to reduce printing as part of our commitment to tackle the Climate Emergency. We will send neighbour notification letters by post where there is no email address</p> <p>As stated on p28 where proposed new development is likely to affect more properties than those that are immediately adjacent to the boundary of the site</p>	

Name/ Organisation/ Comment ID	Comment Summary	Officer Response	Proposed Modification (if any)
	<p>Paragraph 3.15 should include role of councillors and that a Councillor can “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.</p> <p>What grounds does the councillor or chairman have for refusing to call in an application?</p> <p>Paragraph 3.17 states that someone can speak for up to three minutes (at Vale of White Horse planning committees) or five minutes (at South Oxfordshire). Why is this different?</p> <p>23) Paragraph 3.17 - 'planning committee arrangements can change' – please define in what manner arrangements can change. If a member of public is down to speak and so far their communication has been in writing as they are not on-line, how will changes be communicated to them?</p> <p>24) Paragraph 3.21 spells practice without a “c”.</p> <p>25) Paragraph 3.28 does not make clear how community groups can be assured that the District/Town/Parish council will cascade info about S106 and methods of applying for funds.</p>	<p>(e.g. ‘major’ applications), wider consultation may be carried out.</p> <p>These points are covered further in the councils’ constitutions which set out the procedures the councils follow for committee. This is not covered in the SCI.</p> <p>In the unlikely event of a last minute change we will endeavour to make contact by any reasonable means we can to make contact.</p> <p>Detail about S106 is not included in the SCI. We do not consult on S106.</p>	<p>Check for typo in practice.</p> <p>Typo – 3.21 practise</p>

Name/ Organisation/ Comment ID	Comment Summary	Officer Response	Proposed Modification (if any)
	<p>26) The status of S106 contributions (already paid, still available, ringfenced) should be updated regularly by the District Council and communicated to the town/parish councils.</p> <p>27) Section on Pre-application advice 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 phone or face to face meetings.</p> <p>28) No mention of the enforcement of CIL and S106 commitments. These should be included.</p> <p>29) Material reasons for objecting to a planning application should be included in the glossary.</p> <p>30) No mention of development forums. We have found the development forums for Crab Hill and Grove Airfield a useful way of providing communication channels between the community and the developer. Suggest that these should be made a formal part of the process for any large development where applications involve /are part of a large scheme of more than 200 dwellings</p>	<p>We will notify town and parish councils or parish meetings of the sums available for identified community facilities and provide an update to them on a six-monthly basis</p> <p>We normally publish the meeting notes if they are produced instead of the letter, often a letter is done following the meeting(s).</p> <p>This is not directly relevant to the SCI.</p> <p>This is covered on our website and a link is provided</p> <p>Noted. Further detail will be included on forums.</p>	<p>Add that meeting notes are published when available</p> <p>Include further information on use of forums</p>
ID: 177103094	Natural England are unable to comment, in detail, on individual Statements of Community Involvement but information on the planning service we offer, including	Noted	

Name/ Organisation/ Comment ID	Comment Summary	Officer Response	Proposed Modification (if any)
	advice on how to consult us, can be found on our website.		
ID: 177103341	<p>Key sustainability objective for the preparation of Local Plans and Neighbourhood Plans should be for new development to be co-ordinated with the infrastructure it demands and consider the capacity of existing infrastructure.</p> <p>Thames Water (TW) consider that the specific consultation bodies should be identified, including identification of relevant water and sewerage undertaker, in the SCI. TW consider it would also be helpful if the specific sewerage/water undertakers covering the area are listed i.e. TW.</p> <p>Adequate time should be allowed for TW to consider options/ proposals so that an informed response can be formulated.</p> <p>Realistic consultation periods with water and sewerage undertakers will need to be taken account of in the preparation of the Local Plan.</p> <p>Important that Thames Water are consulted early regarding Neighbourhood Plans and their impact on water supply and sewerage capacity.</p> <p>TW would expect to be consulted on most major planning applications.</p>	<p>This point relates 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>Noted.</p> <p>Please liaise with the councils at the relevant time to discuss engagement on the local plan if it is felt further time is needed.</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>We will consider adding an appendix of statutory consultees</p>

Name/ Organisation/ Comment ID	Comment Summary	Officer Response	Proposed Modification (if any)
	TW support the reference at paragraph 3.34 to encouraging applicants to consult TW	Noted	
ID: 177106933	<p>SODC registering applications for discharging conditions is difficult to find online and is not good practice</p> <p>It is wrong and undesirable for officers to be able to take decisions in circumstances where:</p> <p>1. There has been a highly material change in circumstances That information should be highlighted in the officers report and was not mentioned.</p>	<p>This comment relates to specific case.</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>This comment will be passed on.</p>	



**Alternative formats of this publication are available on request.**

**These include large print, Braille, audio, email,  
Easy Read and alternative languages.**

**Please contact customer services to discuss  
your requirements on 01235 422600.**

**If you wish to provide general feedback about  
how we can improve our services then please email  
[enquiries@southoxon.gov.uk](mailto:enquiries@southoxon.gov.uk)  
or [enquiries@whitehorsedc.gov.uk](mailto:enquiries@whitehorsedc.gov.uk)**

**Planning Policy Team  
135 Eastern Avenue,  
Milton Park, Milton, OX14 4SB  
Tel: 01235 422600  
Email: [planning.policy@southandvale.gov.uk](mailto:planning.policy@southandvale.gov.uk)**