

Schedule of Representations submitted on the draft Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) (2019)

This document has been prepared by Somerset West and Taunton.

© Somerset West and Taunton

Copies of SCI LDS are available from: Somerset West and Taunton

The Strategy Team, Deane House, Taunton, TA1 1HE

Tel: 0300 304 8000

Email: strategy@somersetwestandtaunton.gov.uk

For further details and to view and download this and other documents, please visit our website.

<https://www.somersetwestandtaunton.gov.uk/planning-policy/local-developmentscheme/>

Accessibility: this document is also available in Braille, large print, on tape and on disc and we can translate it into different languages. We can provide a member of staff to discuss the details. (confirm / insert appropriate equalities logos / text when upload onto SWT web site)



Organisation	Comment ID	Summary of comment	Proposed / Recommended Response	Proposed / Recommended Change
1) SWT	SCI/1/1.1	<p>Note that draft SCI combines the statutory lists under the planning act and the Duty to Cooperate regulations. Suggests identifying the following as solely Duty to Cooperate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LEP, Office of Rail Regulator, Local Nature Partnerships, Civil Aviation Authority, National Health Service Commissioning Board, Clinical Commissioning Groups. 	<p>Agree with the suggested change which accords with the legislation.</p>	<p>Within Appendix A identify those organisations listed by the respondent as “solely as “Duty to Cooperate”.</p>
	SCI/1/1.2	<p>Within the former West Somerset Council area there are zones around Hinkley which statutorily require the LPA to consult the Office for Nuclear Regulation (ONR).</p>	<p>Although on our contact data base, this organisation was omitted in error.</p>	<p>Within Appendix A add Office for Nuclear Regulation (ONR).</p>
	SCI/1/1.3	<p>The statutory provider for Health Services is South West NHS.</p> <p>Non-statutory consultees:</p>	<p>Although on our contact data base, this organisation was omitted in error.</p>	<p>Within Appendix A add South West NHS.</p>
	SCI/1/1.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Blackdown Hills AONB and Quantock Hills AONB. Very valuable bodies who carry out the function on behalf of the other LPA’s and SCC. Not technically a statutory body for planning policy. As they do not fit particular well under the other categories and they are an “arm” of the LPA’s and keep them in the statutory list. 	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>No change required.</p>



	SCI/1/1.5 SCI/1/1.6 SCI/1/1.7 SCI/1/1.8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mono Consulting are a private company and infrastructure provider – suggest they are removed from the list. • RWE npower are a private company and infrastructure provider – suggest they come off the list. • Avon and Somerset Police under the Police and Crime Commissioners Office are a general consultee rather than a specific – but it’s difficult to see where under the general they would go. • Devon & Somerset Fire & Rescue and South west Ambulance Trust (as above). 	<p>Agree with the suggested changes which accord with the legislation.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>	<p>Within Appendix A, remove “Mono Consultants Ltd and RWE”.</p> <p>No change required.</p> <p>No change required.</p>
2) South West Water	SCI/2/1.1	Note content of document. No specific comments.	Noted.	No change required.
3) Highways England	SCI/3/1.1 SCI/3/1.2 SCI/3/1.3	<p>Note that Highway England (HE) are a Statutory consultee within the SCI.</p> <p>No specific comments on draft SCI.</p> <p>Within context of Local Plan process, HE are keen to work with SWT to ensure the early identification and assessment of transport matters and options.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Welcome forthcoming cooperation on such matters.</p>	<p>No change required.</p> <p>No change required.</p> <p>No change required.</p>



<p>4) Carhampton PC</p>	<p>SCI/4/1.1</p>	<p>Page 7 para 19</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Refers to the Localism Act 2011 and appears to indicate that this Parish Council should have been or be looking at preparing a Neighbourhood Development Plan. Is this something we have to do or an option open to us. 	<p>The Localism Act 2011 (as amended) and other Acts gives the Parish / Town Council the opportunity to prepare a Neighbourhood Development Plan. You do not have to. As written, we accept that this is not clear. We will look to amend this text in the final version of the SCI.</p>	<p>Amend para 19, the start of the 2nd sentence to read as follows:</p> <p>“Town/parish councils make the decision on whether to prepare these documents, when successfully completed, they form ….”</p>
	<p>SCI/4/1.2</p>	<p>Page 16 para 66 last sentence.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Under the previous West Somerset Council, if a PC raised an objection to a planning application, that application had to be determined by the Planning Committee. It now appears that a PC have only 14 days from Validation in which to get its Ward Councillor to seek “call in” of an application. This shortened time limit is unfair. PC asks that further consideration be given to the period of 14 days. If implemented, would mean that the Parish Council has just 14 days from validation of an application to lodge an objection through one of the Ward Councillors for initial consideration by the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the 	<p>The Council changed the scheme of delegation for the former West Somerset area so that it now aligns with the former Taunton Deane area.</p> <p>The Council accepts that the last sentence of para 66 should be amended to reflect current practice that</p>	<p>Amend para 66, last sentence to read as:</p> <p>“Given this, <u>a 21 day response period will usually apply to the initial consultation</u> and a 14 day response period will usually apply for reconsultation.”</p>



		<p>Planning Committee who would alone determine if the application was determined by the Committee or by officers under delegated authority.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In line with members of the public, parish councils should have 21 days from validation to make lodge comments. • The suggestion that Parish Council objections should be routed through the relevant District Ward Councillor is impractical and potentially unnecessarily time and consuming. 	<p>SWT allows 21 days for an initial consultation, if we receive amended plans a follow up consultation will be sent allowing 14 days for any additional comments.</p> <p>We also note the parish councils concerns regarding “call in” but are not proposing to amend the SCI on this matter. In our opinion, the concern expressed is not an accurate record of the process for an application being taken out of Officer Delegation which is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where there are conflicting views (giving clear planning reasons) from a Town/Parish Council, Parish Meeting or Ward 	<p>No change required with regard to “call in”.</p>
--	--	---	---	---



	<p>SCI/4/1.4</p>	<p>Page 23 4th line from the bottom.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is reference to “TDBC development plan” but no reference to the West Somerset version. Is there a reason for this? 	<p>Member as well as from four or more individuals.</p> <p>To be consistent with other parts of the SCI, we accept that this sentence should also refer to West Somerset. We will look to amend this text in the final version of the SCI.</p>	<p>Amend 4th line from the bottom of page 23: after TDBC add “and WSC”</p>
--	------------------	---	--	--



	SCI/5/1.2	Seeking assurance that no further housebuilding is encouraged or allowed until provision is made for jobs and community infrastructure.	This is not a matter for the SCI. The forthcoming "Issues and Options" document afford the chance to express such views.	No change required.
	SCI/5/1.3	Concern expressed that the local capacity of roads, schools and places of assembly should match the additional population that housing brings.	This is not a matter for the SCI. The forthcoming "Issues and Options" document afford the chance to express such views.	No change required.
	SCI/5/1.4	Look forward to the next round of consultation when SWT brings forward their perception of the issues facing rural communities and the options for addressing those issues. "	Noted.	No change required.



<p>6) Creech St Michael Parish Council</p>	<p>SCI/6/1.1</p>	<p>With regard to DM consultations, requests that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That the PC is informed of ALL planning applications in its Parish. • If a request for PC observations on a Planning application have not been forthcoming at the end of the agreed period (normally 21 days unless agreed alternatively) a reminder to be sent to the Clerk. • Once initial consultations and responses have been received a reply should be sent to advise of acceptance (or not) of the point made to SWT. Thereafter, a further, shorter consultation be undertaken in order that consultees can see the other responses and SWT proposed changes ahead of a report going to Executive for decision/ratification. • Once consultation has taken place, revision or amendment be identified then correspondence should be sent to those who were consulted (incl PC) ahead of a decision. 	<p>The suggested amendments would appear the run contrary to the governments advice and criteria for speeding up the determination of planning applications as set out on their web page at: https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/improving-planning-performance-criteria-for-designation</p> <p>SWT's approach to consultation periods and processes is consistent with government legislation.</p>	<p>No change required.</p>
--	------------------	--	--	----------------------------



	<p>SCI/6/1.2</p>	<p>With regard to App D Neighbourhood Planning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The inclusion of include a single page schematic giving an overall diagram and timeline of the steps stated in order to pictorially demonstrate the NH Plan process being undertaken. 	<p>Welcome suggestion. We will look to include a diagram explaining the Neighbourhood plan process in the final version of the SCI.</p>	<p>Change required. Within Appendix D, insert a diagram explaining the Neighbourhood plan process (draft attached).</p>
	<p>SCI/6/1.3</p>	<p>Request that planning policies (such as the Playing Pitch Strategy) be subject to a programme of policy reviews and that PCs have input into the form of the reviews.</p>	<p>Noted. However, this is not a matter for the SCI. The timetable for producing our new district wide local plan and its associated documents is set out in our Local Development Scheme which is publically available on our web site at:</p> <p>https://www.somersetwestandtaunton.gov.uk/planning-policy/local-development-scheme/</p>	<p>No change required.</p>



<p>7) West Somerset Flood Group</p>	<p>SCI/7/1.1</p>	<p>Given the importance of the Climate Emergency for local place making, the Group would like to be included in the list of General Consultation Bodies in Appendix A.</p>	<p>The organisations listed reflect the statutory lists under the planning act and the Duty to Cooperate regulations.</p> <p>We do understand the importance of the West Somerset Flood Group and will ensure that they continue to be included on the Council's contact database.</p>	<p>No change required.</p>
-------------------------------------	------------------	--	--	----------------------------



<p>8) Langford Budville Parish Council</p>	<p>SCI/8/1.1 SCI/8/1.2</p>	<p>Note contents of draft SCI.</p> <p>As the Local Plan progresses, the PC looks forward to setting out their views on planning development and related issues for our parish on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The protection and maintenance of listed buildings. • The protection of the rural location with an emphasis on retaining the unique identity of the villages and hamlets in our community. • The possibility of ceasing to consider planning applications from Tone where a small area falls into our parish. • The possibility of moving the village envelope (settlement boundary) in Langford Budville, to reflect a sensible approach to recent development / outline planning permission. <p>"</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. The forthcoming "Issues and Options" document afford the chance to express such views.</p>	<p>No change required. No change required.</p>
--	--------------------------------	--	--	--



9) Lichfields: (on behalf of client- Bourne Leisure Limited)	SCI/9/1.1	<p>Pre- Application (for the applicant to undertake)- Paragraph 52 Endorse the Council’s recognition that Community Involvement and Engagement is a key part of the planning process However, to in order to accord and align with the wording within National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (paragraph 40) and Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) suggest that paragraph 52 of the SCI is amended to read as follows:</p> <p><i>“We recommend that <u>all</u> applicants undertake appropriate and effective pre- application consultation with the community before submitting an application, <u>taking into account the scale of the development proposal.</u> Early engagement with the Council, local community and key stakeholders can identify and address issues before applications are submitted, shape the design of the development and ensure sufficient information is submitted for an application to be registered and a recommendation made.”</i></p>	Agree in full.	Amend paragraph 52 of the SCI as suggested by the respondent.
	SCI/9/1.2	<p>Also that the beginning of paragraph 55 of the SCI is amended to read: <i>“<u>Where appropriate,</u> the Council expects an applicant....”</i> Proposed amendments <u>underlined and in red.</u></p>	Agree in full.	Amend paragraph 55 of the SCI as suggested by the respondent.

Source of Data: H:\Local Plan SWT01 Project Management\05 SWT District Wide LP SCI\SCI Public Consultation Responses

Proposed diagram outlining the Neighbourhood plan process.

(In response to representations made by Creech St Michael Parish Council (Rep No SCI/6/1.2))

