

**The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004
Revised Statement of Community Involvement for West Berkshire 2014**

Summary of Representations

Under the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 the Council is required to produce a Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) which sets out how it intends to achieve the principle of continuous community involvement. The Council invited comments on the draft revised SCI for six weeks from Friday 23rd May to Friday 4th July 2014. A summary of the representations received and details of how the representations will be taken into account in the preparation of the final version of the revised SCI are outlined in the table below

Respondent	Summary of Representation	Council's Response
Giles Dereham	Remains opposed to any development which will increase road traffic, particularly along Hollybush Lane, and to be taken into consideration when considering any application for Sulhamstead, Ufton Nervet, and the Burghfield Common areas.	Comments noted. Comments in relation to specific sites will be invited and taken into account as part of our preferred options consultation on the Housing Site Allocations DPD. Subject to Council approval on 22 July 2014, this will run between 25 July and 12 September 2014.
	Unable to understand the remainder of the consultation.	
Lucy Cliffe on behalf of Fisher German LLP	Response included attached plan of Government Pipelines and Storage Systems apparatus.	Comments noted.
	Asked to be contacted if any works are undertaken within the vicinity of GPSS pipelines.	
Angela Atkinson on behalf of Marine Management Organization	MMO has no comments to submit in relation to the consultation.	Comment noted.
Alka Desai on behalf of Natural England	MMO has no comments to submit in relation to the consultation.	Comment noted.

Respondent	Summary of Representation	Council's Response
Mr Benjamin Walmsley	Section 3.21 Special consultation consideration should include developments of any size where the land was previously designated as protected, such as in the green belt or outside of the town/ development boundary (or where the boundary has recently been moved to enable development to happen)	Comments noted. Para 3.21 makes it clear that the reasons for an application being regarded as 'significant' can vary. It is not considered practical to deal with all applications in the countryside (outside a settlement boundary) as 'significant'.
Mr Miles Thompson on behalf of Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead	RBWM have no specific comments to make on the contents of the draft SCI. RBWM welcome commitment to joint working and engaging positively and constructively with WBC.	Comments noted.
Brian Clifford on behalf of Network Rail	No objections or comments on the SCI from a waste and mineral viewpoint.	Comment noted.
Mrs Joanne Gostick on behalf of Donnington Valley Action Group	No comments but asks to be kept informed on the progress of the SCI	Comment noted. Respondent already on the register of consultees and will therefore be kept informed of progress.
Mrs Jo Friend on behalf of Theale Parish Council	Members of Theale Parish Council are of the opinion that there are sections of the community who are difficult to engage with, but that this issue is not adequately addressed in the draft revised SCI.	Comment noted. The approach the council will take is set out in paragraphs 1.5 and 1.6 which makes it clear that the SCI is based on the fundamental principles of inclusiveness and equality for all.

Respondent	Summary of Representation	Council's Response
Stephen Yandell on behalf of the Highways Agency	The HA have no objections or other comments on the draft SCI.	Comment noted.
Mr Martin Small on behalf of English Heritage	EH have no comments to make on the Draft SCI, and are satisfied with consultations received from WBC on development management and planning policy matters.	Comment noted.
Morgan Barbara on behalf of Network Rail	Comments relating to any proposal for development likely to result in a material change in the character of traffic using level crossings over a railway under Schedule 5 (f)(ii) of the Town & Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) Order, 2010. The response includes examples of how level crossings may be impacted by development. The Draft SCI should include a specific policy emphasising the legal requirement to contact Network Rail as per Schedule 5.	Comment noted. This is prescribed in the DMPO and therefore does not require an additional reference in addition to the paragraphs 3.6 and 3.7 of the SCI
Mrs Claire Barnes on behalf of Hungerford Town Council	Page 6, section 3 is titled Community Involvement in the Plan Making Process. Paragraph 2.9 refers to Neighbourhood Plans and how these can be part of the Community Involvement process for the Local Plan / DPD & Planning Applications. However it is understood that there are very few of these in West Berkshire. It is recommended that a paragraph is added after 2.9 which refers to Parish Plans.	Comments noted. The purpose of the SCI is to look forward with regard to future engagement in Neighbourhood Plans. The SCI does not cover all planning documents that the Council produces or all non statutory documents, such as parish plans and village design statements, produced as part of the community planning process. The role of the SCI is to set out how documents (as listed in paragraph 2.3 - 2.10) produced by West Berkshire Council as part of the Local Plan will be consulted on.

Respondent	Summary of Representation	Council's Response
	<p>Hungerford has a community based plan which includes sections that are helpful and relevant to land use planning in West Berkshire. This is especially the case as the Parish Plan has had significant direct consultation with the local population, with for example an almost 50% response rate to a detailed survey to every household in the parish of Hungerford. To not refer to and include the Parish Plans would be a serious failure in Community Involvement.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The West Berkshire Core Strategy policy CS19 supported by paragraph 5.140 clearly sets out the Councils' approach to "non statutory" community planning documents. <i>"The Council actively encourages the production of non-statutory community planning documents such as Town and Village Design Statements and Parish Plans and where they have been adopted or endorsed by the Council will use them to inform and support the policies contained within this Core Strategy and other subsequent DPDs".</i> The role of the SCI is to set out how documents (as listed in paragraph 2.3 - 2.10) produced by West Berkshire Council will be consulted on.</p>
	<p>Reference should also be made to Development Briefs produced by Parish or Town Councils. Hungerford has produced one for the rail station area. This has involved much local consultation and is also relevant and helpful to the Local Planning process and Planning Applications for that area.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The West Berkshire Core Strategy policy CS19 supported by paragraph 5.140 clearly sets out the Councils' approach to "non statutory" community planning documents. <i>"The Council actively encourages the production of non-statutory community planning documents such as Town and Village Design Statements and Parish Plans and where they have been adopted or endorsed by the Council will use them to inform and support the policies contained within this Core Strategy and other subsequent DPDs".</i> The role of the SCI is to set out how documents (as listed in paragraph 2.3 - 2.10) produced by West Berkshire Council will be consulted on.</p>
	<p>Appendix A Refers to Organisations and bodies to be consulted. We welcome the fact that Town Councils are included in this list.</p>	<p>Comments Noted.</p>
	<p>Appendix C Glossary Parish Plan is described as 'Non Land Use'. This is an error and should be corrected.</p>	<p>Comments Noted. The Localism Act 2011 introduced a very clear</p>

Respondent	Summary of Representation	Council's Response
		distinction between Parish Plans and Neighbourhood Development Plans and this is reflected in Appendix C.
Mr Chris Scorey on behalf of Hungerford Town Plan	<p>Our main concern is that the draft revised SCI fails to mention the role of community based planning and, therefore, implies that all the town plans, parish plans and village design statements which have been prepared in West Berkshire will not be regarded as community involvement in the Local Plan.</p> <p>We are also very concerned that the meaning of parish plans is being changed retrospectively to exclude land-use planning.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>The West Berkshire Core Strategy policy CS19 supported by paragraph 5.140 clearly sets out the Councils' approach to "non statutory" community planning documents. "The Council actively encourages the production of non-statutory community planning documents such as Town and Village Design Statements and Parish Plans and where they have been adopted or endorsed by the Council will use them to inform and support the policies contained within this Core Strategy and other subsequent DPDs".</p> <p>The role of the SCI is to set out how documents (as listed in paragraph 2.3 - 2.10) produced by West Berkshire Council will be consulted on. The Localism Act 2011 introduced a very clear distinction between Parish Plans and Neighbourhood Development Plans and this is reflected in Appendix C.</p>
	<p>1) FAILURE TO ACKNOWLEDGE COMMUNITY PLANS</p> <p>The draft SCI is badly flawed in its failure to describe and acknowledge the key role played by town and parish plans in the Council's consultation with local communities. WBC has very actively encouraged the creation of community plans as a means of giving local communities a voice in the decisions which affect them.</p> <p>Of the 63 parishes in West Berkshire, 45 have produced community plans and 17 have produced village design statements all of which have been adopted by WBC. Those parishes which have included public feedback on housing development in their community plans have a population in excess of 132,000 which is approximately 86% of the population of West Berkshire according to the 2011 Census.</p> <p>If their views, as expressed through their community plans, are to be ignored in the Local Plan, this would be compelling evidence that WBC has failed to consult local</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>The West Berkshire Core Strategy policy CS19 supported by paragraph 5.140 clearly sets out the Councils' approach to "non statutory" community planning documents. "The Council actively encourages the production of non-statutory community planning documents such as Town and Village Design Statements and Parish Plans and where they have been adopted or endorsed by the Council will use them to inform and support the policies contained within this Core Strategy and other subsequent DPDs".</p>

Respondent	Summary of Representation	Council's Response
	<p>residents. The Hungerford Town Plan group believes that the SCI should include a clear statement of the significance of town and parish plans in its consultation with communities and how the views expressed in those plans will be used in the preparation of the Local Plan.</p> <p>2) NEW DEFINITION OF PARISH PLANS The Glossary in the draft SCI contains a new definition of Parish Plans which says that they are a "Non land use five year vision". This exclusion of land use is being proposed retrospectively after the vast majority of parishes have produced community plans which include public feedback on land use planning. Those plans have been adopted by WBC, including their land use planning content. Therefore, this topic is definitely within scope of parish plans. We appreciate that community planning groups, representing the views of residents, have a different perspective to WBC planners. However, to ignore parish plans as a vehicle for public consultation or to rule out anything they say about land use planning, is a gross breach of trust with the communities who have worked so hard to produce them.</p>	<p>The role of the SCI is to set out how documents (as listed in paragraph 2.3 - 2.10) produced by West Berkshire Council will be consulted on.</p> <p>Comments noted. The Localism Act 2011 introduced a very clear distinction between Parish Plans and Neighbourhood Development Plans and this is reflected in Appendix C.</p>
<p>Mrs Sylvia Breadmore on behalf of Town and Manor of Hungerford</p>	<p>Introduction The Town and Manor of Hungerford Charity (which is an entirely separate entity from Hungerford Town Council) is a major landholder in Hungerford, owning 400 acres of land, including Hungerford Common Portdown, Freeman's Marsh, Hungerford Fishery, the Hungerford Town Hall and Corn Exchange building, the John O'Gaunt public house, the Croft, the War Memorial and the cricket and football grounds. The remit of the Trustees is to manage these assets for the benefit of the inhabitants of Hungerford which they have successfully done for over 600 years.</p> <p>General comment The draft Statement of Community Involvement makes no mention of the important role played by Town and Parish Plans as a means of gathering the views of local communities. Trustees of the Town and Manor of Hungerford have devoted many hundreds of man hours supporting the creation of the Hungerford Town Plan and its 2013 refresh. They did this on the clear understanding that this was West Berkshire Council's chosen method for seeking the views of local people. The Hungerford Town Plan is a very</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Comments noted. The West Berkshire Core Strategy policy CS19 supported by paragraph 5.140 clearly sets out the Councils' approach to "non statutory" community planning documents. "The Council actively encourages the production of non-statutory community planning documents such as Town and Village Design Statements and</p>

Respondent	Summary of Representation	Council's Response
	<p>clear statement of the wishes of Hungerford residents. It provides overwhelming survey based evidence that they place huge importance on the protection of open access land, such as Hungerford Portdown and Freeman's Marsh.</p> <p>We believe that it is vital that the WBC Local Plan should include the views of local communities as expressed through community plans. We can only assume that the omission of town and parish plans from the SCI draft is an oversight. We look forward to this being rectified in the final draft and would expect that such plans are acknowledged as the primary method by which WBC has sought the views of local communities on issues which affect them, including land use planning.</p> <p>Glossary The draft proposes a completely new definition of a Parish Plan as a "Non land use five year vision produced by and for local communities which includes an action plan" Community input to land use planning is a key element of parish plans. Housing development and potential loss of greenfield land is an issue which concerns most communities and this is borne out in their parish plans. This proposal to redefine the meaning of parish plans when more than 45 in the district have already been completed and adopted by WBC is totally against the spirit of community based planning which has been so actively promoted by WBC. We note that Neighbourhood Plans are to be regarded as part of community involvement despite the fact that only one has been produced in West Berkshire. We strongly encourage WBC to retain the entirely sufficient definition of parish plans which is used in their current SCI - "Parish Plan - Sets out a vision for how a local community wants to develop and identifies the actions needed to achieve it."</p>	<p>Parish Plans and where they have been adopted or endorsed by the Council will use them to inform and support the policies contained within this Core Strategy and other subsequent DPDs". The role of the SCI is to set out how documents (as listed in paragraph 2.3 - 2.10) produced by West Berkshire Council will be consulted on.</p> <p>Comments Noted. The Localism Act 2011 introduced a very clear distinction between Parish Plans and Neighbourhood Development Plans and this is reflected in Appendix C.</p>
Jeremy Holden-Bell on behalf of the Newbury Society	<p>The Newbury Society welcomes this revised draft and has the following comments.</p> <p>1. The Policy should specifically encourage public consultation meetings, like the recent Churchill Living at Cromwell Place, to be held before a formal planning application is submitted, so that the planning application already addresses community concerns.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The NPPF encourages early engagement by developers and the local community and the SCI sets out in para 3.23 that for significant applications developers will be expected to show how they have involved the community in preparing their proposals. It is not considered necessary to specify what form of consultation this should be as this may vary from application to application. Appendix A lists the statutory consultees while paragraphs 2.11 and 2.12 provide details of who we will involve when we</p>

Respondent	Summary of Representation	Council's Response
		are preparing documents. It does not provide a list of specific local groups and organisations as they can change. The continuous updating of the register of consultees is considered a more responsive platform than a static list.
	2. The Appendix A should include local heritage and civic organisations that should be consulted.	Comment Noted. Appendix A lists the statutory consultees while paragraphs 2.11 and 2.12 provides details of who we will involve when we are preparing documents. It does not provide a specific list of local groups and organisations as they can change. The continuous updating of the register of consultees is considered a more responsive platform than a static list.
Mr Gareth Johns on behalf of the Environment Agency	Satisfied the Draft SCI does not prejudice the EA as a statutory consultation body under the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure (England) Order)2010. Support the inclusion (para 2.19) that is is important that co-operation os ongoing throughout the preparation of a particular DPD.	Comment noted.
John Moran on behalf of Health and Safety Executive	The HSE have no representation to make on the draft SCI on this occasion, as it is not concerned with the potential encroachment of future development on the consultation zones of major hazard installations on MAHPs maps within the Local Plan to identify encroachment onto consultation zones.	Comment noted.
	HSE do not need to be informed on the next stages in the adoption of the SCI. The HSE would like to be consulted on future Site Specific Allocations within DPDs.	Comment noted. Respondent already on the register of consultees and will therefore be kept informed of progress
	The HSE recommends that any major hazard installations and MAHP's are marked on maps within the Local Plan to identify encroachment onto consultation zones. HSE do not need to be informed on the next stages in the adoption of the SCI.	Comments noted.

Respondent	Summary of Representation	Council's Response
David Wilson on behalf of Savills	<p>Thames Water property services are now delivered by Savills. Response includes a range of information in regards to the NPPF and Local Plans.</p> <p>Thames Water welcome the fact they are specifically identified as a consultation body within Appendix A. However, Thames Water consider that they should be specifically listed as the water supply and sewerage undertaker for the district within Appendix A so that it is clear who the utility providers are.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Appendix A to be reworded as follows: '<u>Thames Water (as sewerage and water undertaker) (as water supply and sewerage undertaker)</u>'.</p>
	<p>Thames Water also suggested the LPA should carry out early consultation with Thames Water in regard to Local Plans and Neighbourhood Plans to allow sufficient time for sewerage modelling exercises to be undertaken to identify any potential impact on the network.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Paragraphs 2.17 to 2.23 cover the Duty to Cooperate and in accordance with the NPPF, the council will work collaboratively with Thames Water as a utility and infrastructure provider in the preparation of planning documents.</p>
Cllr Alan Macro	<p>That there are sections of the community who are difficult to engage with, but that this issue is not adequately addressed in the draft revised SCI.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>The approach the council will take is set out in paragraphs 1.5 and 1.6 which makes it clear that the SCI is based on the fundamental principles of inclusiveness and equality for all.</p>