

Section 1: Introduction	
<p><i>Paragraph: 1.2</i> SCI/4/12                      <i>John Hayter</i></p> <p>Paragraph 1.2 says "Part of the City Council's role is to provide the right kinds of opportunities to enable people to get involved in ways that best suit their needs". The other part of the role is not mentioned. The only way offered is by public participation in normal or special meetings held by the LPA, parish councils and other mainly voluntary bodies.</p>	<p><i>The SCI is intended to make it quite clear that the Council is committed to providing a broad and adaptable range of opportunities for people to become more easily and effectively involved, both in planning matters and in other areas of Council activity. Such opportunities range from advice and information given at the level of the individual householder, resident or business proprietor, through to the involvement of large numbers of people, in the case of major areas of Council policy or major planning proposals. This type of local engagement is likely to involve more people and may, therefore, require formalised arrangements for meetings, exhibitions etc. Although the SCI outlines some of these more complicated mechanisms for consultation and engagement, it is not intended to put undue emphasis on these particular methods. <u>It is indicative rather than fully embracing.</u></i></p> <p><i>Proposed Change:</i></p> <p><i>Paragraph 1.2, first sentence: '...to enable <u>and encourage</u> people to get involved...' Second sentence: '...with a greater <u>and very important</u> understanding...'</i></p>
<p><i>Paragraph: 1.3</i> SCI/4/13                      <i>John Hayter</i></p> <p>In the context of the 'Ladder of Participation', paragraph 1.3 states "the important thing is to make sure people understand the impact their ideas can have". The SCI is focused on levels 2 to 4, without recognising that level 1 (inform) has not been met and that the SCI has not identified the steps to do so.</p>	<p><i>In terms of informing individuals, as well as the District's many and varied communities of interest, the SCI recognises that the timely distribution of accurate information plays an essential part in generating community interest and a more meaningful and mutually helpful dialogue with the Council: for example, in regard to such issues as Development Plan and Supplementary Planning Documents and the determination of planning applications.</i></p> <p><i><u>Overall, the Council greatly values genuine dialogue with all its stakeholders.</u></i></p> <p><i>Proposed Change:</i></p> <p><i>Paragraph 1.3, after fourth sentence add: <u>'Conversely, the trigger for involvement can come from the community, when their expectations of the Council are just as, if not more legitimate, than if we had</u></i></p>

	<p><u>made the approach. In both scenarios, the limitations of dialogue in achieving (or) limiting change need to be well understood by all parties'.</u></p>
Section 2: Our Values and principles	
<p><i>Paragraph: 2.1</i>  <i>SCI/4/15 John Hayter</i></p> <p>SCI is not 'creative and innovative in all that it does'. It is primarily setting down long standing practices and, far from being creative, certain critical ones are omitted e.g. Local Plan Committee and written representations to PDC.</p>	<p><i>Part of the purpose in producing a Statement of Community Involvement is to clearly describe the Council's consultation and decision-making procedures, in order to create a clearer understanding of what is involved. In this way, it is intended to encourage more individuals and groups to take an active part in policy and strategy making for the District and, importantly, in regard to all planning matters.</i></p> <p><i>In addition to promoting a wider understanding of the processes involved, the Council intends, as is made clear in the Consultation Draft Statement, to be an organisation which is both creative and innovative in its approach. However, it is accepted that such an approach may not be suitable or feasible, in regard to every aspect of Council activity. Therefore, a change to this particular bullet-point and its supporting text is recommended.</i></p> <p><i>Change Proposed:</i></p> <p><i>Paragraph 2.1, fourth bullet-point: 'is creative and innovative <del>in all that it does</del></i></p> <p><i>These values form part of the Council's <u>currently adopted corporate strategy, which is subject to annual review reviewed annually</u>'</i></p>
<p><i>SCI/37/1 Alison Mathews</i>  <i>From: Itchen Valley Parish Council</i></p> <p>Find the use of the word 'customers' strange, as the Council is not selling its services and it is not clear who is meant to be included in this expression. A definition is required.</p> <p><i>Paragraph: 2.2</i></p> <p><i>SCI/37/2 Alison Mathews</i>  <i>From: Itchen Valley Parish Council</i></p> <p>Add "The interests of those who currently live and work in Winchester should be the prime concern of the Council".</p>	<p><i>SCI/37/1 There are circumstances in which the Council does act as a service provider on the basis of a commercial arrangement e.g. prescribed charges for dealing with planning applications and where the use of this word would be entirely appropriate. Nevertheless, this particular 'value' is taken directly from the Council's Corporate Strategy and the wording used here is as set out <u>there</u>.</i></p> <p><i>SCI/37/2 The comment is noted. However, as indicated above, these aims are taken from the Council's Corporate Strategy and it would not, therefore, be appropriate for the SCI to change this. <u>While the point is understood, it would be difficult for the Council to appear partial or prejudiced.</u></i></p>

<p><i>Paragraph: 2.4</i>  <i>SCI/4/18                      John Hayter</i></p> <p>The SCI refers to monitoring 'values and principles but sets no overall objective for what the SCI is intended to achieve. The section should set objectives by reference to the 'Ladder of Participation'. Only the 'Empower' level is consistent with the stated values and should, therefore, be stated as a long-term objective.</p> <p><i>SCI/4/17                      John Hayter</i></p> <p>The principle of community involvement being accessible has not been met. It only gives examples of access by way of participating at meetings and I would expect this approach to fail criterion (v), of the Tests of Soundness.</p>	<p><i>SCI/4/18 It is considered that, in paragraph 2.3, the SCI clearly describes the Council's objectives for involving local people and organisations. However, it is agreed that a further reference to the value of 'empowerment' could usefully be made in paragraph 2.2. It is, therefore, recommended that the word 'Empowerment' should replace the word 'Involvement' at the beginning of the third bullet-point.</i></p> <p><i>SCI/4/17 The SCI makes it quite clear that 'accessibility' is of paramount importance, if a genuine increase in levels of community engagement is to be achieved.</i></p> <p><i>Whilst the Statement does give relatively detailed information regarding organised participation and collective involvement, it is considered reasonable to provide for the many situations in which residents, businesses and other individuals may take a broadly shared, or widely diverging, view and where these could be expressed most effectively through some form of open forum. This can be helpful in terms of exchanging both information and opinion.</i></p> <p><i>Nevertheless, the Statement does repeatedly make it clear that the Council is anxious to be both flexible and adaptable in its approach to all individuals and groups and to provide every opportunity for direct contact and engagement, not only with planning but all areas of Council activity.</i></p> <p><i>The Council initiates and/or participates in a number of programmes intended to raise levels of awareness and interest in local community issues and, partly through these, a wider local interest in public participation and engagement from a 'grass-roots' level. A number of these initiatives have been referred to through the SCI and although some have planning aspects others, such as the Winchester 4 Business project and the Winchester Youth Forum, are intended to both raise levels of participation among targeted groups and local empowerment more generally.</i></p> <p><i>Change Proposed: Paragraph 2.2, third bullet point: 'Empowerment <del>Involvement</del> of local people...'</i></p>
<p><i>Section 2: General Comment</i>  <i>SCI/10/7                      Vera Osborne</i>  <i>From: Parish Council of Denmead</i></p>	<p><i>As an expression of its commitment to improving on current engagement processes, the Statement's reference to creativity and innovation is considered to be both necessary and appropriate, though we</i></p>

<p>A case can be made that WCC being "creative and innovative in all that it does" ignores the need to consolidate changed processes and, at times, maintain the status quo.</p>	<p><u>need to recognise the varying scope for their delivery, dependent on circumstances.</u> (See, also response under paragraph 2.1, above).</p> <p>However, as an equally important part of good practice, the Council will seek to retain and build on those techniques and strategies which have already been successful in achieving greater local participation. In this respect, it is important that the value of effective two-way communication, together with high-quality feedback from the Council, are clearly emphasised.</p> <p>No Change.</p>
--	---

Section 4: How to get involved	
<p><i>Paragraph: 4.5</i>  <i>SCI/37/3 Alison Matthews</i>  <i>From: Itchen Valley Parish Council</i></p> <p>Where a ward member is on the planning committee he/she is unable to be "a voice for the community", in relation to planning, unless they give up their right to vote on an application.</p>	<p><i>The respondent's comment is noted. Councillors may <u>and do</u> comment on issues raised by the community, provided they have not been part of a lobby group or otherwise predetermined the application. This follows normal practice and case law. The Council's Planning Protocol gives guidance on such issues.</i></p> <p><i>Proposed Change:</i></p> <p><i>Paragraph 4.5, sixth sentence, add: '...under Your Council and Representation'</i></p>
<p><i>Paragraph: 4.8</i>  <i>SCI/14/4 Pat Edwards</i>  <i>From: City of Winchester Trust</i></p> <p>The Town Forum meets infrequently and discusses subjects selected by the City Council and determined by City Councillors. All other parts of the district are represented by Parish Councils and are directly represented on the Local Strategic Partnership Board.</p>	<p><i>As referred to elsewhere, in the response under paragraph 3.7, the Council has considered the issue of community representation within the <u>non-parished</u> areas of the City. The introduction of the Town Forum is intended to provide an additional channel of communication and regular opportunities for the open discussion of current issues affecting the City.</i></p> <p><i>The present forum arrangement, <u>the effectiveness of the facility which this provides and the frequency of its meetings</u> will <u>all</u> be kept under review. However, this is not a matter where it would be appropriate for the SCI to seek a specific change.</i></p> <p><i>No Change.</i></p>
<p><i>Paragraph: 4.9</i>  <i>SCI/14/5 Pat Edwards</i>  <i>From: City of Winchester Trust</i></p> <p>Formal 'Scrutiny' is welcomed. However, feedback after giving</p>	<p><i>The importance of providing accurate feedback without undue delay is fully accepted. Under normal circumstances the Chair of a Scrutiny Panel will advise members of the public attending a Panel meeting of the subsequent availability of minutes of the meeting, on the Council's web-site.</i></p>

evidence is needed.	<p><i>Where an Informal Scrutiny Panel is set up to review a particular issue and report back on this to the main Panel, officers of the Team involved in this will directly feed back information on outcomes/decisions to any individual or group that had been invited to present evidence to the Informal Panel.</i></p> <p><i>Proposed Change:</i></p> <p><i>Paragraph 4.9, after first sentence add: <u>'Together, they underline the Council's commitment to promote, in all its dealings with the public, a genuine dialogue and information flow between interested parties.'</u></i></p>
---------------------	--

Section 5: Community Involvement and the new planning system	
<p><i>Paragraph: 5.2</i> <i>SCI/40/1 Will Harding</i></p> <p>This section talks about wishing to "create areas with a strong sense of identity". Often the residents have a strong sense of identity and it is external planning impacts that seek to destroy it. Suggest "create and preserve"</p>	<p><i>It is considered that the SCI's aim of helping to strengthen and, where necessary, build community identity is entirely valid. Nevertheless, it is accepted that it is also appropriate to recognise the value of maintaining a sense of community, where this already exists. It is proposed that the wording of paragraph 5.3 should be amplified, accordingly.</i></p> <p><i>Change Proposed:</i></p> <p><i>Paragraph 5.2, third sentence: '...create <u>and protect</u> areas with a strong sense of identity.'</i></p>

Issue: Planning Applications	
<p><i>Paragraph: 5.4</i> <i>SCI/10/1 Vera Osborne</i> <i>From: Parish Council of Denmead</i></p> <p>The issue of strengthening community involvement occurs throughout the document. In recent years there has been no discernable impact of local Denmead views on decisions relating to development control, or the WDLPR. This gives the impression that if these don't fit the 'Winchester' view, then there is not much point in commenting.</p> <p><i>SCI/36/3 John Duncan</i></p> <p>"Improved flow of information" - once preliminary discussions have taken place, residents in the immediate vicinity and NDS officers should be informed immediately.</p>	<p><i>SCI/10/1 The Council regrets any sense, on the part of the Parish Council, that its views have not been heard or acted upon. The City Council <u>is absolutely committed</u> to increase both the quality and quantity of local participation and community engagement in decision-making in all parts of the District. The production of a transparent Statement of Community Involvement is one element, intended to help carry that process forward.</i></p> <p><i>Notwithstanding this, the Council does accept that continuing development pressures on all parts of the District create a very considerable challenge for the Council, its district partners and the wider community. One example of the Council's ongoing efforts to respond to that challenge and engage with local communities, including Denmead, has arisen in the case of the currently proposed Major Development Area West of Waterlooville.</i></p> <p><i>SCI/36/3 – SCI/37/5 To inform all significantly</i></p>

<p>SCI/37/5            Alison Matthews</p> <p>From: Itchen Valley Parish Council</p> <p>Does the expression "at the earliest possible stage" mean that Parish Councils, residents etc. will in future be informed as soon as a potential developer contacts the planning department? In the past, this was not done due to commercial sensitivity.</p>	<p><i>affected residents, Parish Councils and other relevant interests of any formal development proposals 'at the earliest possible stage' is, and will remain, a key objective of the SCI.</i></p> <p><i>The Council is absolutely committed to the principle of transparency in its dealings with all individuals and communities of interest. Therefore, <u>informal 'preliminary enquiries' made by private householders, landowners or developers, in instances where the significance or potential impact of the proposal on the wider public domain is likely to be minimal, can normally responded to by the Council with a degree of sensitivity and/or respect for reasonable commercial confidentiality.</u></i></p> <p><i>There is, however, a mechanism provided by the Freedom of Information Act, whereby a specific request can be made to the Council, for it to consider revealing such information, although the Act does recognise that in some situations, <u>reasonable confidentiality should be protected.</u></i></p> <p><i><u>In the case of larger schemes, or those likely to have a significant public interest, we believe that such proposals should be brought into the public domain at the earliest possible opportunity. In such circumstances, the Council could not undertake to guarantee to maintain confidentiality with regard to providing preliminary advice on such proposals.</u></i></p> <p><i>From the SCI standpoint there is, additionally, a distinction in regard to pre-application contact between applicants/agents and the local community. If the applicant fails to undertake pre-application consultation, appropriate to the scale and nature of the application, or is unwilling to release the results of pre-application discussions, <u>disclosure of further information may be required in order to properly assess the material considerations relevant to that particular case.</u></i></p> <p><i>Proposed Change:</i></p> <p><i>Paragraph 5.20, after second sentence: <u>'In the case of householder or minor applications, likely to generate little if any public interest, requests for informal preliminary advice can normally be responded to by the Council with a degree of sensitivity and/or respect for reasonable commercial confidentiality. However, in the case of larger schemes or those likely to have significant public interest or impact on the wider public realm, we believe that such proposals should be brought into the public domain at the earliest possible opportunity.</u></i></p>
--	---

	<p><u><i>In such circumstances, the Council could not guarantee to maintain confidentiality with regard to providing preliminary advice on such proposals.</i></u></p> <p><i>New Paragraph 5.21: 'It will be necessary...'</i></p> <p><i>(Re-number subsequent paragraphs)</i></p>
<p><i>Paragraph: 5.6</i> <i>SCI/4/28                      John Hayter</i></p> <p>The SCI procedure regarding site notices and comment periods cannot be met unless they are coincident. As flexibility on site notices is acceptable to the LPA there is no reason for not permitting more flexibility on comment periods. To maximise the opportunity to involve Parish Councils and other organisations, a five week comment period is required to accommodate a calendar monthly meeting schedule.</p>	<p><i>The procedure set out in the Consultation Draft is meant to be adhered to. Recent staffing constraints have, however, led to a delay in some notices being forwarded to applicants/agents for display on site. The resultant timing difference between notices and comment periods, which the Council does not regard as being some form of inbuilt, or acceptable, 'flexibility', are currently the subject of determined efforts aimed at their elimination.</i></p> <p><i>Additionally, and In the interests of greater clarity, it is recommended that the wording of paragraph 5.36 should be amended to set out more precisely what is expected of applicants/agents.</i></p> <p><i>In order to meet the targets set by Government, the Council's PDC Committee schedule is based on a three-week cycle. While there may be occasions when that interval is extended, as a general rule it would not be possible to maintain the necessary frequency of meetings and allow for a five-week comment period.</i></p> <p><i>Change Proposed:</i></p> <p><i>Paragraph 5.36, second sentence: 'in the majority of cases applicants, or their agents, are <u>required</u> to erect such notices and, in practice, <u>are given a total period of up to 28 days, during which time they must make the necessary advance arrangements to allow the notice to be displayed on site for not less than 21 days.</u>'</i></p>
<p><i>Paragraph: 5.20</i> <i>SCI/11/4                      Amanda Dunn</i> <i>From: Environment Agency</i></p> <p>It should be made clearer that, for issues that fell within their remit, statutory consultees would be keen to be involved in pre-planning discussions with the LPA and applicant.</p> <p><i>SCI/13/3                      Julian Cooper</i></p> <p>The SCI is not explicit enough. In particular it needs to address the pre application process. All developments of one house or more should be posted</p>	<p><i>SCI/11/4 The comment is noted. It is accepted that the SCI could helpfully refer to the fact that, for certain types of proposal, early contact with relevant statutory consultees could usefully inform pre-application discussions and early community involvement. It is, therefore, recommended that a useful reference to this could be made in paragraph 5.23.</i></p> <p><i>SCI/13/3 One of the Council's main objectives, in producing an SCI, is to ensure that every reasonable step is taken to improve the quality of consultation, and to broaden out the involvement of individuals and communities of interest in the development control process. The requirements of the pre-</i></p>

<p>to local NDS site.</p> <p><i>SCI/17/4 Patrick Martin</i></p> <p><i>From: Teg Down NDS Core Group</i></p> <p>Paragraph 5.20 and following paragraphs are too weak. Developers should be obliged to consult neighbours, not merely notify. Consultation should take place during a defined period (e.g. 6 weeks) before plans are submitted.</p> <p><i>SCI/30/4 Bobbie Neate</i></p> <p>Paragraph 5.20 is not strong enough. Need meetings with local residents before development plans have been drawn up.</p> <p><i>SCI/40/2 Will Harding</i></p> <p>This should be more definitive and, to that end, should change "expects" to "requires".</p> <p><i>SCI/28/3 Margaret Fawkes</i></p> <p><i>From: Local Resident NDS group</i></p> <p>Should be more consultation between developers, residents and the Council. This must take place before final plans are submitted. Communication of outcomes is also necessary.</p>	<p><i>application process are dealt with at a number of points in Section 5 of the SCI (Note, also the response given under Paragraph 5.4, above).</i></p> <p><i>Notwithstanding this, it should be pointed out that although NDS groups are valued for the contribution which they make, they are self-appointed and do not have an equivalent status to Town or Parish Councils.</i></p> <p><i>SCI/17/4, SCI/30/4 Whilst the Council does not disagree with the underlying sentiments expressed by this group of respondents, it does not accept that the spirit and content of paragraph 5.20 are weak. On the contrary, the SCI reaches to the limit of what is permitted by central Government.</i></p> <p><i>SCI/40/2 As an illustration of this, the use of the word 'expects' is generally considered to be acceptably robust, whereas the mandatory control implied by the word 'requires' does not accord with the adaptable approach recommended by Government and would be unlikely, therefore, to meet the 'Tests of Soundness', at the later stages when the SCI is subject to formal 'examination'.</i></p> <p><i>SCI/28/3 The Council fully acknowledges the importance of feeding back quality information on decisions made and the outcome of any schemes put forward for approval. Partly through the establishment of a Major Applications Team and other related adjustments within the Development Directorate, and partly through further development of its website, the Council intends to improve performance in this area, in so far as resources will permit.</i></p> <p><i>Change Proposed:</i></p> <p><i>Paragraph 5.23, an additional sentence after the third sentence: 'Additionally, for certain types of proposal, early contact with relevant statutory consultees will inform both pre-application discussions and early community involvement.'</i></p>
<p><i>Paragraph: 5.22</i></p> <p><i>SCI/35/2 S.D Sadler</i></p> <p>'At an early stage' is not explicit enough. The local community should be involved as soon as a developer has decided to proceed, and before any plans are drawn up.</p>	<p><i>The phrase used in the Draft SCI is considered to be both clear and reasonable. Whilst it is desirable to involve residents at an early stage, this cannot necessarily be enforced by the Council, which may itself be unaware of the proposal.</i></p> <p><i>Furthermore, to consult local residents, groups or others without the aid of sufficient explanatory material could be counter-productive and lead to misconceptions regarding the scheme's content and details. This could also hinder more sustainable and</i></p>



	<p><i>acceptable development which might otherwise result from a better understanding of local community needs.</i></p> <p><i>Proposed Change:</i></p> <p><i>Paragraph 5.22, second sentence: ‘...consider and address issues at <u>the earliest practicable stage</u> in the planning process...’</i></p>
<p><i>Paragraph: 5.23</i> <i>SCI/35/3 S.D Sadler</i></p> <p><i>This should go further; stipulating either written confirmation of agreements made with residents, or minuted meetings recording this. Verbal agreements are not reliable.</i></p> <p><i>SCI/36/6 John Duncan</i></p> <p><i>Pre-application consultation must be enforced, and from the outset.</i></p>	<p><i>SCI/35/3 This comment is noted. A response on this issue has been given above, under paragraph 5.18.</i></p> <p><i>SCI/36/6 This comment <u>is also noted</u>. The Council is making every reasonable effort to achieve genuine consultation from the very beginning of the process.</i></p> <p><i>No Change.</i></p>
<p><i>Paragraph: 5.24</i> <i>SCI/37/7 Alison Matthews</i> <i>From: Itchen Valley Parish Council</i></p> <p><i>How will the accuracy of the statement of public participation be checked? Parish Councils could be asked to confirm that they agree with the statement.</i></p> <p><i>SCI/40/6 Will Harding</i></p> <p><i>Defines Table 7 as giving examples of the kinds of community involvement exercises. This is insubstantial. For medium and large scale applications it is important to have a fixed process where the developer: contacts the right neighbours and groups; conducts consultations(s); records the results and; makes the altered application.</i></p>	<p><i>SCI/37/7 This comment is also noted. A response with regard to the recording and verification of matters arising from early contacts between developers and local communities is given under paragraph 5.18, above.</i></p> <p><i>As explained above, under paragraph 5.20, ‘fixed processes’ are unlikely to comply with the Government’s tests, which will be later applied to determine whether or not the Council’s SCI can be confirmed as being ‘sound’.</i></p> <p><i>The Council’s method is, therefore, to incorporate sufficient flexibility for the SCI to be deemed consistent with the Government’s recommendations for an ‘adaptable approach’ to local participation whilst, at the same time, providing a sound and practical framework for the continuing delivery of better community engagement.</i></p> <p><i>Nevertheless, the clear and straightforward process put forward in the response SCI/40/6, is one which the Council would wish to support, by the inclusion of an additional sentence in paragraph 5.23.</i></p> <p><i>Proposed Change:</i></p> <p><i>Paragraph 5.23, after second sentence, add sentence: ‘For medium and large scale applications, the Council considers it sufficiently important to give every encouragement to a transparent process and clear sequence, in which the applicant undertakes to: make <del>initial</del> contact with all <u>relevant individuals and</u></i></p>

	<p><i><u>groups, sufficiently early in the process for their views to have an influence on the scheme</u></i>  <del><i>appropriate individuals and groups;</i></del>  <i>conduct appropriate consultations; accurately record the results of these consultations and; make an altered application, as necessary.'</i></p>
<p><i>Paragraph: 5.25</i>  <i>SCI/37/8 Alison Matthews</i>  <i>From: Itchen Valley Parish Council</i></p> <p>If the system of front loading is to work it is vital that applications are not accepted until all necessary information is available and that no amendments are accepted after the application is submitted.</p>	<p><i>There are minimum requirements for the amount of accompanying information necessary for applications to be registered. These are adhered to by the Council. However, to insist that all information must be initially available is considered 'unreasonable' and would be impractical to impose.</i></p> <p><i>There are quite normal circumstances in which the need for additional, or amplifying, information only comes to light following examination of, or technical consultations relating to, a particular application. It is, nevertheless, accepted that in every instance the Council should strive to obtain timely information, of dependable quality, to properly inform potentially affected parties and other consultees within the community and to guide its own decision making.</i></p> <p><i>Given the requirements of the SCI and the need for the efficient determination of planning applications, the Council <u>will not tolerate</u> amendments to planning applications <u>as a substitute</u> for proper pre-application consultation.</i></p> <p><i>As indicated in paragraph 5.24 of the Consultation Draft, the Council routinely provides written advice relating to householder and other applications, to set out what information is required. The adopted District Local Plan gives further guidance with regard to this and other types of application.</i></p> <p><i>Currently, as part of the process of establishing the new Major Applications Team, consideration is being given to the production of a 'protocol' document, to provide detailed guidance for those intending to make large-scale or more significant applications. This document would also contain information relating to the own Council's standards and commitments for pre-application discussions, as well as other aspects of local consultation and participation.</i></p> <p><i>As part of the ongoing development and improvement of the Council's internet access facility, copies of such guidance and information would also be placed on the web-site.</i></p> <p><i>No Change.</i></p>
<p><i>Paragraph: 5.33</i></p>	<p><i>Planning Officer's reports, which contain summaries</i></p>

<p><i>SCI/37/9 Alison Matthews</i> <i>From: Itchen Valley Parish Council</i></p> <p>Would be helpful if the responses of the consultees were made available on the website and that the planning officer's report to the Planning Committee meeting was made available to the Parish Clerk before the Meeting. The Committee report is needed to decide whether to take up the public speaking option.</p>	<p><i>of all relevant consultation responses, are despatched to City Councillors, Applicants, Clerks of Parish Councils and Chairs of Parish Meetings in time for their arrival at least five working days before the date of the relevant Development Control Committee Meeting.</i></p> <p><i>This also gives time for requests to be made to the Public Speaking Coordinator, for the opportunity to speak at the meeting, in accordance with the Committee's adopted procedures.</i></p> <p><u><i>Copies of consultation replies are taken to the Committee meeting, where officers may be questioned as to the detailed content of any particular response. In addition, copies of consultation responses are now being put on the Public Access area of the Council's web-site, in advance of the meeting. Whilst many consultation responses are received electronically, a number are still received in paper form. These have to be electronically scanned before being put onto the web-site, resulting in occasional delay.</i></u></p> <p><i>No Change.</i></p>
<p><i>Paragraph: 5.35</i> <i>SCI/10/1 Vera Osborne</i> <i>From: Parish Council of Denmead</i></p> <p>Neighbourhood notification - Denmead has increasing instances of sites, adjacent to an application site, that have not been notified of the proposal. A tangible definition of "neighbour" would be a useful addition to the SCI.</p> <p><i>SCI/23/7 Alison Goss</i></p> <p>Too late. Notification essential at earlier stage.</p> <p><i>SCI/24/2 Lee Atkinson</i></p> <p>Residents should be consulted, not just notified. Consultation should start as early as possible and should continue throughout the planning process.</p> <p><i>SCI/4/27 John Hayter</i></p> <p>Neighbour notification is described as "according to the allocating officer's assessment of which properties may be affected by the proposed development." This is the former</p>	<p><i>SCI/10/1 – SCI/24/2 The Council's current procedures for issuing all forms of publicity and neighbour notification, following the receipt of planning applications, are set out in Section 5 of the Consultation Draft SCI. The various methods of publicising new planning applications are intended to be complementary and, especially in the case of larger applications, mutually reinforcing.</i></p> <p><i>Furthermore, Town and Parish Councils, together with Parish Meetings, Residents Associations and Amenity Groups, provide a great deal of help in locally publicising applications.</i></p> <p><i>As referred to elsewhere in these responses, the Council is aware of some slippage which has recently occurred with regard to the issuing of certain site notices. This particular problem is mainly the result of staffing changes which have, in turn, led to a need for increased training. All teams within the Development Directorate are currently working to overcome this particular problem and to reduce the incidence of any slippage to an acceptable minimum.</i></p> <p><i>SCI/4/27 With regard to the associated issue of neighbour notification, the same development control teams are using all available resources, to ensure that notification is carried out as soon as possible after the initial registration of an application, and in</i></p>

system. The new system introduced a 'narrow focus' for neighbour notifications so that notification, although not defined in the report is now only to immediate neighbours. Clearly, many issues impact far wider than the immediate neighbours. This fails to meet the LPA's own standards of consultation.

Notification should be set by proper consideration of the need to consult those most affected and including the hard to reach, not by an inevitably arbitrary and exclusive limit.

SCI/4/32

John Hayter

When the planning officer considers an application, the steps required are to list the applicable plan policies, determine if the application has the required information to assess against these policies and initiate internal consultations where specialist information is required. This analysis should be included in the notifications sent to neighbours, parish councils etc. and the SCI should be amended to include it. It would go to supporters and objectors without bias. It would facilitate the consultation by focusing it around the policy issues it identifies and then enable consultation on whether all policy issues have been identified. This will draw the attention of the uninitiated to matters that are material to their well being.

SCI/4/9

John Hayter

Test of soundness (ix.) "describe policy for consultation on planning applications". Neighbourhood notification is not as described in SCI 5.35 and has been reduced. Site notices may not even be displayed before the comment period expires. Public participation at meetings is the SCI's major method for public involvement. Public involvement at PDC is not part of the SCI and the existing but poorly publicised procedure for placing written communications before them is omitted from the SCI, thus leaving no direct

accordance with the Council's adopted procedures.

*Those procedures, which are subject to periodic review, are intended to balance the often conflicting objectives of efficiency and speed of determination, on the one hand, with effective neighbour notification and other local consultations on the other.*

*However, the adopted procedures do result in neighbour notification standards that exceed the minimum requirements laid down in legislation. Furthermore, in practice, every effort is made to apply the Council's standards evenly throughout the District but on a 'common sense' basis, anticipating and taking account of wider impacts where this is appropriate.*

*Nevertheless, it is accepted that it is important, and necessary, to set out the adopted notification procedures and post these on the upgraded website, where they could then be easily accessed and kept up to date in the event of any changes.*


*As is clearly stated in the Consultation Draft, the Council is anxious to avoid acting in any way which could be regarded as selective, or arbitrary. This is particularly the case in regard to consultation and the exchange of information and equally applies to those individuals or groups which might be regarded as 'hard-to-reach'.*

*SCI/4/32 The routine inclusion, with neighbour and Parish notification, of the kind of 'summary analysis' suggested in this comment, would result in significant additional delay in sending out such notifications. This would, in turn, make it virtually impossible for the Council to receive representations in time to make planning decisions which met the Government's performance targets (Set out in paragraph 5.46).*

*SCI/4/9 Given levels of resource availability that can currently be predicted for the future, It is considered that the practical and logistical disadvantages of such an innovation would considerably outweigh the gains to be made by more widely disseminating relevant information in this particular way. Nevertheless, over time and with more effective and widespread use of electronic communication and internet access, it should be possible to steadily improve ways of sharing this type of information.*

*The issue of 'slippage' in the display of site notices is dealt with above, under SCI/10/1- SCI/24/2.*

<p>public access to the Planning Development Control Committee.</p>	<p><i>The issue of public access to the Council's Planning Development Control Committee is addressed under paragraph 5.41 below.</i></p> <p><i>Proposed Change:</i></p> <p><i>Paragraph 5.35, after second sentence, add: ' <u>The criteria, which form the basis for that initial assessment, will be included on the Council's web-site and updated as necessary, as part of the further development of the Council's internet facility.</u></i></p>
<p><i>Paragraph: 5.39</i></p> <p><i>SCI/4/34                      John Hayter</i></p> <p>Problems arise in officer reports because the discipline of identifying all applicable policies, SPDs and other material considerations is not followed. For example there have been many complaints about Village Design Statements not being taken into account and in such cases the applicable paragraphs should be identified. Without this, the decision process is not transparent to objectors, supporters or the applicant.</p> <p><i>SCI/4/35                      John Hayter</i></p> <p>Problems arise in officer reports because comments have to be summarised and recommendations then take account of the summary. Occasionally comments are omitted and in others, particularly those where a number of separate arguments are made, the summary and therefore the recommendation do not take account of them. Summarising inevitably forms a view of the significance of a comment before it can be properly known. This cannot be a fully transparent process and, therefore, the right to challenge is especially important.</p> <p><i>SCI/4/36                      John Hayter</i></p> <p>Problems arise in officer reports because no consideration is given as to whether the comments made also represent the interests of those who are difficult to contact for dialogue.</p>	<p><i>SCI/4/34 Every effort is made to include all relevant information in officer reports. This includes the matter of bringing the existence of an adopted Village or Neighbourhood Design Statement to the attention of Members and other interested parties.</i></p> <p><i>The purpose of adopting such Statements, as supplementary planning documents, is that they should not only provide a valuable assessment of local character and its most important constituent elements, but that they should be in conformity with currently applicable planning policies.</i></p> <p><i>It is open to Members to question any apparently significant divergence between an officer's recommendation and the content of a Design Statement although, should this be the case, it is very likely that such a disparity would have been identified in the officer's written report.</i></p> <p><i>SCI/4/35 In order to progress with the proper consideration and determination of numerous planning applications, within a finite time-scale, it is unavoidable that some degree of summarisation is used in officer reports. Every effort is made to ensure that those reports are accurate and contain all that is factually relevant to the aim of making reasoned and justifiable decisions. Furthermore, the structuring of the Committee and its procedures make added provision for any clarification or correction of detail, where this is needed.</i></p> <p><i>SCI/4/36 It is normally the case that anyone contacting the Development Directorate, in connection with a current planning application, and who wishes to make a representation, or obtain additional information, will provide some details of how they can be contacted by the appropriate</i></p>

<p>This should be mandatory in every report.</p> <p><i>SCI/4/37                      John Hayter</i></p> <p>Problems arise in officer reports because in some cases and, notably, in considering need for higher density without damaging character, where a compromise has to be made, it is not made in an objective and transparent manner e.g. by identifying the minimum density permitted on the site and then assessing whether the higher density has been achieved by an unnecessary sacrifice of character.</p> <p><i>SCI/4/38                      John Hayter</i></p> <p>The SCI should commit to providing officer reports 10 days before either the PDC Meeting, or before a delegated decision is taken.</p> <p><i>SCI/4/39                      John Hayter</i></p> <p>The implementation of the comments made on 5.39 would result in a revised version of the facility that already exists to make written representations to be provided to each Planning Development Control Member (in any event this procedure should be included in the SCI). An advantage of this procedure is that it allows some written 'participation' in the decision. This would significantly reduce the unacceptable exclusion inherent in only allowing verbal participation and even then only to those who have the communication skill to muster five other objectors or parish council or ward member support. Comment 28 describes how this can be accommodated within the 8 week time scale.</p> <p><i>SCI/4/40                      John Hayter</i></p> <p>There is nothing in 5.39 that could be changed in a minor way and in any event a change would prevent proper annual monitoring of most of the planning application activity.</p> <p><i>SCI/4/41                      John Hayter</i></p> <p>Only 2 of the 6 criteria are known</p>	<p><i>registration or development control team.</i></p> <p><i>Clearly a dialogue, as such, is not always necessary, when the outcome of an initial contact is simply the receipt of an objection or expression of support. Nevertheless, it is the Council's practice to always try to establish a means of making further contact, should this become necessary.</i></p> <p><i>However, given the limited information which can be expected, or asked for by the Council, it is often impractical, especially in the case of an individual, to assess whether or not that person could be said to fall within one of the recognised 'hard-to-reach' groups.</i></p> <p><i>SCI/4/37 Acceptable density ranges, for housing development within the District's built-up areas are clearly set out in Government planning guidance (Planning Policy Guidance Note 3) and repeated in the adopted District Local Plan.</i></p> <p><i>Any proposed increase on the minimum figure would be made clear in an officer's report and if, as a result, there were considered to be issues of potential harm to local character, then such matters would almost certainly be central to the Committee's consideration of the proposal <u>and the planning judgement required in determining such an issue.</u></i></p> <p><i>SCI/4/38 The suggestion that, in the interests of providing greater opportunities for public  involvement, officer reports should be made available either ten days before Planning Committee meetings, or the date on which it is intended to make delegated decisions, is theoretically valid.</i></p> <p><i>However, whilst the Council continues to seek steadily improved performance in the area of public consultation and with regard to the availability of additional material which can inform community participation, the resources are not available at the present time to allow the Council to commit to the sudden changes in procedure which the respondent suggests.</i></p> <p><i>SCI/4/39 In terms of access to the decision-making processes by way of written submission, it has been and still is possible to write to, or e-mail, a Ward Member in connection with a planning application, in advance of any decision being made.</i></p> <p><i>To present what may need to be complicated written submissions to Members in, or preparing to go to, Committee can have a distracting effect and this is</i></p>
---	--

<p>when the application is posted. There are issues such as the provision of high-density affordable housing, where those in need may be excluded because they are not contactable, uninitiated in planning matters, lacking in communication skills and whose needs may be the opposite of the represented majority. The criteria are, therefore, overwhelmingly biased in favour of ensuring as many decisions as possible are delegated and all further comment is muzzled, instead of promoting the widest possible community engagement. The major criteria should be that all applications that affect more than immediate neighbours should go to Planning Development Committee.</p>	<p><i>not always helpful, or productive.</i></p> <p><i>The comments under SCI/4/40 and SCI/4/41 are noted. However, amendments and improvements to the Council's procedures are ongoing, partly to reflect the normal processes of change and partly to incorporate more effective and efficient practices.</i></p> <p><i>The 'criteria' referred to are intended to provide a clear, rational and accessible framework for drawing the distinction between those applications which need to be determined by Members and those other applications, with potentially fewer and/or more localised impacts, which could reasonably be determined under the Council's scheme of delegation. The scheme, as it currently exists, is open to review and, if that is thought to be beneficial, change.</i></p> <p><i>However, the scheme is not intended to 'muzzle' community involvement. On the contrary it is, to an extent, used in order to free up limited resources to allow more focused attention to be paid to those, admittedly fewer, applications which could have significant impacts over a wide area.</i></p> <p><i>Without seeking to belittle the importance to individual residents, or local communities, of 'householder' or other proposals which may affect a smaller neighbourhood area, the more major applications that are submitted are regarded by the Council as fully meriting the very detailed attention which their scale, and often inbuilt sensitivity, demand.</i></p> <p><i>Proposed Change:</i></p> <p><i><u>Paragraph 5.37, after sixth sentence, add: 'You can also contact your ward Councillor in writing, by e-mail or by telephone. Councillors hold face-to-face surgeries which can be a useful point of contact. Details of these will be publicised in your area or, alternatively, you can obtain this information by getting in touch with the City Council or by looking at our web-site'.</u></i></p>
<p><i>Paragraph: 5.44</i></p> <p><i>SCI/37/1 Alison Matthews</i>  <i>From: Itchen Valley Parish Council</i></p> <p><i>It would save time if the name of the planning officer dealing with the application was typed on the front</i></p>	<p><i>This comment is noted. Both the weekly lists of applications received and individual letters of notification identify the case officer for each application. <u>Efforts are currently being made to add information regarding part-time or job-share officers' normal work patterns to the cover sheet and/or</u></i></p>

sheet.	<u>letters of notification.</u>  No Change.
<p>SCI/37/1      Alison      Matthews</p> <p><i>From: Itchen Valley Parish Council</i></p> <p>Public speaking on planning applications is not encouraged by the Council. Speakers can wait several hours. They should be told when their item will be heard.</p>	<p>Certainly there are practical limitations on time, if the business set out in the Planning Committee's pre-arranged agenda is to be dealt with during a meeting of reasonable length.</p> <p><i>Allowing for the normal, and inevitable, fluctuations of presentations and debate every effort is, nevertheless, made to give intending speakers guidance on approximate timings <u>and their participation is certainly encouraged.</u></i></p> <p>No Change.</p>

Issue: Resources	
<p>Paragraph: 5.27</p> <p>SC/23/08      Alison Goss</p> <p>Sufficient resources must be made available to protect the natural environment.</p>	<p>The sentiment contained in this comment is fully accepted. The Council will continue to work towards its aim of maintaining and improving the District's environmental quality. Nevertheless, the practical consequences of the many and various demands on finite public resources have to be accepted and at times, therefore, certain compromises made.</p> <p>Proposed Change:</p> <p><u>Paragraph 5.27, after third sentence, add: 'One example of the Council's efforts to raise awareness of the natural environment is through its work on the Biodiversity Action Plan.'</u></p>

Issue:            Clarity	
<p>Paragraph: 4.9</p> <p>SCI/22/6            R J Cruse</p> <p>Reference is made to Portfolio Holders. Who are they and what do they do?</p>	<p>Portfolio Holders are those Councillors who have been given particular responsibility for an area of Council interest or activity e.g. Planning and Transport (which includes policy planning and development control) or Housing and Communities.</p> <p><u>Those Councillors who hold a particular policy 'portfolio' and who together form the Council's Cabinet. This body makes the majority of Councillor-led decisions, other than regulatory matters such as planning and licensing.</u></p> <p>No Change.</p>
<p>Paragraph: 4.20</p> <p>SCI/14/2            Pat Edwards</p> <p><i>From: City of Winchester Trust</i></p>	<p>The 'One Compact for Hampshire' initiative is a programme jointly developed, promoted <u>and managed</u> by Hampshire County Council and the voluntary and community sectors. It is fully signed</p>



<p>The reference to 'One Compact for Hampshire' in 4.20 and 6.5 is oblique and unclear as to what it means.</p>	<p><i>up to by the City Council.</i></p> <p><i>It is considered that the Consultation Draft SCI gives an adequate explanation of the purpose of this scheme, which is essentially aimed at providing greater consistency in all future dealings between individual Hampshire district authorities and the voluntary and community sectors.</i></p> <p><i>Proposed Change:</i></p> <p><i>Paragraph 6.5, after second sentence add new sentence: ' This initiative is a programme jointly developed, promoted <u>and managed</u> by Hampshire County Council and the voluntary and community sectors.'</i></p>
<p><i>SCI/35/1                      S.D Sadler</i></p> <p>Expressions such as 'as appropriate', 'as necessary', 'relevant', 'might' etc are woolly and open to interpretation.</p>	<p><i>This comment is noted. However, the use of such terms is not intended to be loose or to leave unnecessary room for dispute or arguments over meaning and interpretation. On the contrary, such phrasing is used primarily in order to provide a sensible and reasonable degree of flexibility and adaptability in anticipation of the SCI's intended future application, <u>in a variety of different circumstances and across the full range of Council activity.</u></i></p> <p><i>No Change.</i></p>

<p><i>Availability of information</i></p> <p><i>SCI/25/2                      Mike Cunliffe</i></p> <p><i>From: Winchester Gospel Hall Trust</i></p> <p>Significant numbers of people do not have internet access. Website development must be paralleled by a good hard copy distribution system.</p> <p><i>SCI/4/23                      John Hayter</i></p> <p>WCC's partners HCC should be asked to establish a publicly accessible on-line system that would provide a topic heading for every PPG/PPS, with direct links to the full text. HCC should also supply on-line: a copy of the corresponding adopted plan policies in each of Hampshire's Local Plans and links to the supporting text; any particularly relevant Inspectorate or court</p>	<p><i>SCI/25/2 This comment is noted. A response on the issue of hard-copy, as opposed to the electronic distribution of information, is given under Appendix 1c, above.</i></p> <p><i>SCI/4/23 These comments are noted. As part of improving and further developing its own on-line access system the City Council's Development Directorate intends to provide direct links to the appropriate Governmental web-site, to give access to the text of Government's published planning guidance in the form of its PPG and PPS documents.</i></p> <p><i>With regard to Hampshire County Council's information and access systems, these are beyond the remit and scope of the City Council's SCI. It may, therefore, be more appropriate for a direct approach to be made to HCC on the other issues raised in this comment.</i></p>
---	--



<p>decisions; a list of recognised issues (input only by planning officers); links to emerging pre-adoption documents in all districts and; an on-line forum open to all who sign up for it.</p> <p><i>SCI/4/23                      John Hayter</i></p> <p>Communication on a new topic should be initiated by electronic or postal alerts, with documentation available to study online and at libraries.</p> <p><i>SCI/4/24                      John Hayter</i></p> <p>Providing information electronically tends to be exclusive. Having email and PC "buddies" is becoming more commonplace and if offered as a volunteer service is a way of drawing in the hard to contact, as well as strengthening the community.</p>	<p><i>SCI/4/23, SCI/4/24 The further comments by this respondent are noted. One of the benefits of internet access is that the Council can use this facility to quickly flag-up new topics of interest within the District, or any significant issues that may be emerging. <u>Such information can be refreshed and brought up-to-date on a very regular basis.</u> Partly as the result of Government-supported initiatives to provide for e-governance the District's Town and Parish Council offices have on-line access. Public libraries within the District are similarly equipped.</i></p> <p><i>As stated in response to several comments, the Council is already working towards further development of its web-site and will, in addition, be making every possible effort to eliminate those particular technical difficulties, which have recently been experienced and have caused considerable annoyance and frustration to a number of users. As part of the further development referred to above, the issue of possibly creating a network of 'buddies' can be given further thought.</i></p> <p><i>No Change.</i></p>
---	--

<p><i>Additional Changes to Text/ Diagrams To Update and Correct Minor Errors.</i></p>	
<p>√</p>	<p><i>Page 20, page footer: correct spelling of 'Statement'</i></p> <p><i>Page 25, paragraph 5.18, third sentence: correct word spacing.</i></p> <p><i>Page 26, Diagram 7, key, first line: 'Will be appropriate <u>expected</u>'</i></p> <p><i>Page 28, Diagram 8, header: '...which the Council may undertake, <u>or participate in</u>, when it RECEIVES a planning application.'</i></p> <p><i>Page 28, Diagram 8, first sub-heading left-hand column: 'Publicity Meeting'</i></p> <p><i>Page 28, Diagram 8, second sub-heading, centre column:     ↕ ®</i></p> <p><i>Page 28, Diagram 8, third sub-heading, right-hand column:    √ [light tick]</i></p> <p><i>Page 28, Diagram 8, key, new third line: '®: If requested.'</i></p>

Page 28, paragraph 5.30, second bullet point:  
'follow the progress of an application'

Page 32, paragraph 5.46, last sentence:  
'...involvement should take place. *In addition, the Council has recently formed a Major Applications Team to further help achieve these targets.*'

Page 45, Annex 1b: re-align the information contained in the left- and right-hand columns.

After paragraph 1.5, new paragraph 1.6: "The Statement of Community Involvement gives an opportunity to make greater use of the community planning process and the district-wide evidence base that we are currently building, in order to inform us about community views and aspirations across a number of key areas of Council activity. We will, therefore, use the output from consultation and community involvement to inform policies and documents on which we are seeking views and as part of a broader indirect evidence base which can then help to underpin strategic planning across the board."

After paragraph 3.3, new paragraph 3.4:  
"Nevertheless, we wish to emphasise both the importance we attach to the City Council's working relationship with the District's Town and Parish Councils and our commitment to working more closely with all our parishes, in seeking community views and in expanding and improving community participation."

After paragraph 5.11, new paragraph 5.12: "The community planning process, which is now being developed around Parish Plans, Village and Neighbourhood Design Statements etc, will also provide a core of information about community aspirations which can help to build our LDF. We will, in addition, draw on other information from sources such as the Citizens' Panel and Community Safety Audit to tell us about local needs and aims which should then be reflected in relevant parts of LDF."

After paragraph 4.4, new paragraph 4.5: "The Council now operates a Customer Service Centre which provides a single point of contact for all the City Council's customer communication and enquiries. The Centre is responsible for providing reception facilities and for dealing with telephone,

	<p><u><i>email and personal contacts. The Centre is the first part of a programme of improvements, designed to make the Council and its services more readily accessible to all of the District's communities.</i></u></p>
--	--