

Appendix 1 Consultation Responses

Respondent ID	Name of Respondent	Response
001	Natural England	We regret we are unable to comment, in detail, on individual Statements of Community Involvement but information on the planning service we offer, including advice on how to consult us, can be found at: https://www.gov.uk/guidance/local-planning-authorities-get-environmental-advice
002	Resident	<p>Whilst I am well aware that we live in a technological age I am also well aware that people of my age group (B. 1938) have never had to use technology in the workplace and therefore cannot respond to websites because they have no means of doing so in old age.</p> <p>Therefore, we feel disenfranchised when we cannot make relevant comments on matter which may affect us directly or on wider issues on which we have opinions and concerns. Even more so when we are advised to make contact information via different websites or indeed when we can seek out that information either at Castle House or libraries etc. Those in charge should also remember that we may also have mobility problems!</p> <p>Whilst I do not know the population figures for Newark and Sherwood, either wholly or its independent parts does the Council know exactly how many of them actually have 'online' access and particularly in those areas of real poverty? Clearly if the Council only relies on emails/ 'online' responses then the Council is only being given a slanted view of the public and other stakeholders views on planning policy documents and planning applications, and particularly where a non 'online' person may be concerned and not able to comment or visit Castle House for relevant information, or indeed come to a planning committee meeting in order to speak.</p> <p>I also believe that if a resident is close to a proposed development, then the outcome must be given to the in writing. I hope that you find the above comments of interest and amend public consultation accordingly.</p>
003	National Highways	We are content with the contents of the document and have no further comments to make.
004	TOWN-PLANNING.CO.UK	<p>In relation to the consultation on the SCI update, I have the following comments to make:</p> <p>Review timetable – Under Regulation 10A (b) of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 (as amended) the LPA is under a statutory duty to review a statement of community involvement, the review must be completed every five years, starting from the date of adoption of the statement of community involvement, in accordance with section 23 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. It is 9 years since the SCI was last reviewed. Paragraph 1.11 of the SCI should set out this statutory obligation in order that readers can understand how regularly the SCI is required to be reviewed.</p> <p>Terminology – The SCI (and indeed the N&S website) continues to use the terminology of Local Development Framework or LDF; since the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 the statutory terminology has</p>

Appendix 1 Consultation Responses

		<p>been Local Plans and this terminology has become embedded into the NPPF, Planning Practice Guidance and other documents produced by Government bodies such as the Planning Inspectorate. The SCI does use the term Local Plans in places and LDF in other places. The term LDF is a legacy of the previous system and continuation of using it has significant potential to cause confusion. LDF as a term is now a non-statutory term only used by some LPAs who generally have dated plans, for example your neighbouring LPAs no longer use the term LDF but have moved to the term Local Plans. Continuing to use the term LDF gives the impression that N&S are not up-to-date.</p> <p>Local Plan Production – The SCI commits the LPA to undertaking two stages of consultation under Regulation 18, referred to as ‘Issues and Options’ and ‘Preferred Approach’. This exceeds the statutory minimum, which is laudable but does in turn mean that plan making will be slower overall. Given that Regulation 10A (b) of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 (as amended) imposes a statutory duty on the LPA to review a Local Plan every 5 years, a process involving additional stages does not sit well against that statutory duty. The Allocations and Development Management Policies DPD started issues consultation in July 2019 and the examination is unlikely to be completed until 2025, a process that will by then have taken almost 6 years. As the Council are now in the process of doing Local Plan Reviews which can be light touch, it seems to me that the SCI gives the expectation of additional consultation stages which are no longer appropriate, it should reflect the statutory requirements.</p> <p>Consultation on Planning Applications – Paragraph 3.17 sets out 21 days as being the consultation period, however this is incorrect for applications for Permission in Principle (PIP). Under Article 5G of the Town and Country Planning (Permission in Principle) Order 2017 (inserted by the 2017 Amendment Order) the default consultation period for PIP is only 14 days. As PIP has a 5-week determination period, if a 21-day consultation period is expected then inevitably it makes determining such applications within the prescribed period for PIP difficult for the LPA. There are also some forms of applications such as demolition notifications or some prior approval notifications where a 28-day determination applies and there is in fact no consultation requirement. The SCI should identify these differences.</p>
005	Historic England	<p>Many thanks for consulting Historic England on the above consultation. We have limited comments to raise at this time. We welcome the amendment to our organisation name: Historic England. We note and welcome the reference to the historic environment within the environmental objective indicator. We look forward to working with the Council on any Local Plans documents as they are prepared and offering our statutory advice.</p>
006	Canal & River Trust	<p>Planning Policy Documents</p> <p>Although the Trust is neither a specific, nor general consultation body, it is a statutory body, one of the seven main groups identified in Section 2.8 of the SCI Update. The Trust’s interests, operations, and landholdings in the district, relating to the river navigation, could be affected by future development.</p>

Appendix 1 Consultation Responses

		<p>Therefore, we welcome the LPA’s consultations on previous and current Planning Policy documents and request that we are similarly consulted on future consultations.</p> <p>Planning Applications The SCI update covers Pre-application advice. Section 3.5 states that the LPA’s pre-app advice will help applicants through advising “on any consultation that should be carried out before an application is submitted”. This is welcomed, as it provides the opportunity for the LPA to flag engagement with the Trust where the navigation could be affected. The Trust also offers a pre-app advice service.¹ We would encourage either:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the LPA to use this service directly and provide feedback to applicants on any issues raised; or • the applicant seek advice directly from the Trust, via this service; <p>where there is the potential for the navigation or its surroundings to be affected by development.</p>
007	Coal Authority	<p>It is noted however that this current consultation relates to a Statement of Community Involvement and I can confirm that the Planning team at the Coal Authority has no specific comments to make on this document.</p>
008	Southwell Civic Society	<p>We welcome the amendments to the 2015 Document especially the provision in Clause 3.24 to allow members of the public to speak at Planning Meetings. This is of course common practice in most Authorities and works well at Southwell Town Council Meetings. The Society does not expect to take up this opportunity on a regular basis but there have been a few occasions in the past when it would have been of benefit to the Councillors to hear first hand the views of our members. Often on large developments long and complicated written submissions can be daunting for Councillors to read.</p> <p>In respect of the rest of the document we would hope that where larger scale projects are proposed (Clause 3.7) that the authority will ensure that public consultations by the applicants are meaningful and not just PR ticking box exercises paying lip service. Many in the past have been superficial and have totally ignored legitimate concerns of the community.</p> <p>We would support the Council in adopting this document.</p>