

Appendix B: Summary of responses received to consultation on the Draft Statement of Community Involvement 2019

Reference	Name/Organisation	Comments	EFDC response and proposed action
1	Ian Cuthbert	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Asks what additional facilities will be provided for Epping &amp; North Weald?</li> <li>No specific facilities written into Local Plan.</li> <li>Does revised LP include specific facilities?</li> </ul>	This comment is focused on the Local Plan and is not directly related to the draft SCI. No changes proposed. Infrastructure requirements are set out in the LPSV and IDP
2	David Gascoigne	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The document and language used is too vague and not specific enough</li> <li>Need to make more definitive statements about validity of the officer's role in planning vs members rights.</li> </ul>	This issue is more appropriately addressed in a planning protocol and is not something for the SCI. No changes proposed
3	Planning EE	No comments.	Noted and no action required
4	Tessa Craig – Canal River Trust	<p>Would like to be consulted where development is likely to affect:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>any inland waterway (whether natural or artificial) or reservoir owned or managed by the Canal &amp; River Trust, or</li> <li>any canal feeder channel, watercourse, let off or culvert, which is within an area which has been notified for the purposes of this provision to the local planning authority by the Canal &amp; River Trust.</li> </ul>	<p>The Council could setup a system to 'flag-up' any development proposal which may affect waterways and channels. The best way to achieve this would be for the Trust to provide us with a mapping file which sets out a 'consultation zone' (e.g. 50 metres either way of a waterway)</p> <p>Action: To contact the Canal Trust for further information.</p> <p>No change required to the SCI.</p>
5	Kathryn Oelman (Lawson Planning Partnership Ltd) – Princess Alexandra Hospital Trust	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PAH supports general principles and provision for engagement in pre-application discussions and the strategic masterplanning process</li> </ul>	Matters raised by LPP relate to the timescale for the delivery of the new Princess Alexandra Hospital. Programme should be set out in an agreed Planning Performance Agreement. This is not a matter for the SCI and no changes are proposed.

Appendix B: Summary of responses received to consultation on the Draft Statement of Community Involvement 2019

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PAH therefore invites the Council to agree a specific consultation timescale and programme for the East Harlow allocation which takes account of the timings for the new hospital, and proactively ensures adherence.</li> </ul>	
6	Beverley Rumsey – Epping Town Council	<p>Broadly happy with draft SCI, subject to following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Weekly lists should continue to be emailed to Town and Parish Councils</li> <li>Epping Town Council's comments should be taken notice of due to considerable local knowledge</li> <li>Once made the Epping NP should be used for consultation.</li> </ul>	<p>Action: Amend the 4<sup>th</sup> bullet in the Application Stage box on page 12 as follows:</p> <p><i><u>'Weekly lists of planning applications submitted will be posted on the Council Website and emailed to Town and Parish Councils in the District.'</u></i></p> <p>ETC's comments have been, and will continue to be considered on relevant planning applications.</p> <p>In relation to the Epping NP, any 'made' NP will form part of the Council's Statutory Development Plan</p>
7	Network Rail	No comments.	Noted but no action required
8	David Linnell – Loughton Residents Association Plans Group	<p>Generally happy with the revised statement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggest an addition to the text of the first bullet point on page 11 relating to pre-app discussions.</li> <li>Important for Council to state specifically that any statements made by Officers do not bind the Council at application stage and that a different outcome may result.</li> </ul>	<p>Action: Add a new bullet point at the end of the Pre-application stage box on page 12 as follow:</p> <p><i><u>'It is important to note that pre-application advice represents officer opinion on the proposed scheme and evidence presented at the time. Any advice at this stage is given without prejudice to the formal consideration of any subsequent planning application.'</u></i></p>

Appendix B: Summary of responses received to consultation on the Draft Statement of Community Involvement 2019

9	Jane Gray	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will the document actually make the much needed change(s) to consultation with promoters of sites on the Local Plan</li> <li>• Fears document is a tick-box exercise</li> </ul>	Noted but no changes proposed
10	S.N. Wilkinson – The Roydon Society	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Remove references to planning reception.</li> <li>• Avoid holding stakeholder briefings/workshops in peak times (i.e. summer holidays and Christmas time).</li> <li>• EFDC need to maintain accurate contact details to ensure that all community groups/parish councils have been consulted sufficiently</li> <li>• For Garden Town matters would like EFDC to provide contact details to East Herts/Harlow</li> <li>• More care is required surrounding Neighbour consultation</li> </ul>	<p>Action: Amend para 1.4 as follow:</p> <p><i>‘...You can also contact us via <u>the Main Planning Reception in the Civic Offices... is staffed between 9am and 4pm Monday to Friday</u>’</i></p> <p>While the Council normally seeks to avoid holding stakeholder briefings/workshops in peak times, this may not be possible in all cases and it is right to maintain flexibility in the SCI. No change to the SCI is proposed.</p> <p>Action: to maintain accurate contact lists</p> <p>The first bullet point on page 8 states that <i>‘We will consult statutory consultees, and as appropriate, engage as proactively as possible with relevant local stakeholders and the community in and around the Garden Town, including across District boundaries.’</i> This includes town and parish councils in neighbouring districts.</p>
11	Gemma Nicholson – Chelmsford City Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CCC considers that the draft SCI is generally clear and comprehensive.</li> <li>• CCC notes the recognition that as part of the statutory Duty to Cooperate,</li> </ul>	Noted but no changes proposed

Appendix B: Summary of responses received to consultation on the Draft Statement of Community Involvement 2019

		neighbouring councils and other relevant organisations must work together on strategic cross boundary issues.	
12	Debra Paris – Loughton TC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Nothing to add to revised statement, aside from bringing to the attention of EFDC that the contact hours in para 1.4 are incorrect.</li> </ul>	See amendments proposed to para 1.4 above.
13	Catherine Williams (Savills) – on behalf of Redrow Homes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not advised directly of this consultation despite being on the consultation register</li> <li>SCI fails to set out a series of improvements to the consultation process which are necessary to make the consultation for each stage of the Plan meaningful and effective.</li> <li>Must notify interested parties at stage 1</li> <li>Improvement of Reg 18 consultation through more effective workshops and ensuring that the evidence base is published at the same time as the Reg 19 draft Local Plan</li> </ul>	<p>The SCI consultation was sent on 28 June 2019 to Savills and there was no indication that the email had failed to deliver. The consultee database now works on a 'opt-in' basis and contacts for Redrow were removed from the consultee database as they did not respond to the Council's email in October 2018 (as part of the GDPR data cleansing exercise) which sought to confirm whether individuals / organisations would like to remain in the database.</p> <p>Action: At the end of the 2<sup>nd</sup> bullet point in the green box on page 4, add the following:</p> <p><u><i>'...Where appropriate individuals and parties on the Council's consultee database will be notified.'</i></u></p> <p>The Council considers that the current level of detail in the SCI for Reg 18 consultation and Reg 19 publication is sufficiently robust for the purpose of the SCI. No change is proposed</p>
14	Aderopo Aderin-Lawson – HNL Sustainable Places	No specific comments	Noted but no action required
15	Lee Stiles - LVGA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>LVGA Response to the Local Plan 2012 Issues and Options (17/09/12) highlighted</li> </ul>	Noted but no changes proposed

Appendix B: Summary of responses received to consultation on the Draft Statement of Community Involvement 2019

		<p>the Councils lack of consultation and failure to comply with their own policy (10.104L) and consult the Lea Valley Growers Association and seek other expert advice</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Limited confidence in SCI based on historical behaviours of the Council</li> </ul>	
16	Andy Butcher (Strutt and Parker) – on behalf of Countryside properties	<p>Areas of concern include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>increased clarity on Developer Forums.</li> <li>the heading <i>pre-application – strategic masterplans and concept frameworks for strategic sites</i> is misleading and should be deleted as the requirements relate solely to masterplans and concept frameworks.</li> <li>Statement that public engagement will occur at two stages of the process is over prescriptive and may not be necessary in all circumstances</li> </ul>	<p>Comment noted with regard to Developer Forum but the current level of detail in the SCI is considered to be appropriate.</p> <p>Action: Remove the heading 'Pre-application - Strategic Master Plans and Concept Frameworks for strategic sites' on page 10</p> <p>The Council does not consider reference to a two-stage process as overly prescriptive and this approach has previously been agreed by Cabinet.</p>
17	Richard Carr - TFL	No specific comments	Noted but no action required
18	Kayley Smith – Highways England	No specific comments	Noted but no action required
19	Mark Hickey	<p>Issues raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consultations over last four years have been largely ignored</li> <li>Expert and professional opinion from many respected organisations was side stepped or disregarded</li> </ul>	<p>Noted but no changes proposed</p> <p>The comments relate to the Local Plan process and are not relevant to the SCI.</p>

Appendix B: Summary of responses received to consultation on the Draft Statement of Community Involvement 2019

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Certain site allocations have not considered both NPPF and local policies</li> <li>• Evidence used was selective</li> <li>• External consultants have been too heavily relied upon</li> </ul>	
20	Tasha Hurley (Savills) – Thames Water	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thames Water would welcome inclusion of text in the section of pre-application advice to advise developers to liaise with Thames Water to discuss wastewater infrastructure requirements ahead of the submission of any app.</li> <li>• Suggestion to include the link to encourage developer use of Thames Water pre-app service: <a href="https://www.thameswater.co.uk/preplanning">https://www.thameswater.co.uk/preplanning</a></li> </ul>	Noted but no changes proposed
21	Sarah Shirley – Theydon Bois Parish Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Information indicated section 1.4 regarding the planning reception is not current.</li> <li>• Appears to be no publicly-accessible forum for discussion on the drafting of policies with the DC. Would be helpful to have opportunities to comment/ provide observations on some of these policies at a formative stage.</li> <li>• Under the section entitled <b>Who we will notify, consult and involve in plan making</b>, we note that under <b>section 1.13:</b></li> </ul>	<p>See proposed amendment to paragraph 1.4 above</p> <p>Town and parish council are provided with opportunities to comment on emerging policies through the formal consultation process.</p> <p>Action: Amend para.1.13 as follow:</p>

Appendix B: Summary of responses received to consultation on the Draft Statement of Community Involvement 2019

		<p><b>General consultation bodies</b>, Parish, and Town, Councils are not mentioned. Request reference to these be included under this section.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Parish Council would like to be formally notified, and actively involved, if any further initiatives/workshops are put forward in regard to Green Infrastructure.</li> <li>Under the Section entitled '<b>Production of the Draft Local Plan</b>', <b>bullet 3</b> (p.5): the facility to respond online, in writing, or by email was provided, but the public exhibitions and officer contact were only made available in the larger settlements, and there is no recollection of the provision of policy 'surgeries'. Going forward, however, these methods of contact may prove constructive, but would need to be advertised well in advance if they are to be utilised by local councillors or residents.</li> <li>Under the Section entitled '<b>Publication of the Submission Draft Local Plan for representations</b>': The fourth bullet, '<b>Positively prepared</b>' (p.5) is then split into the second column on page 6, but would more logically be sited above '<b>Justified</b>', '<b>Effective</b>', '<b>Consistent with national policy</b>' within the same highlighted box.</li> <li>Under the Section entitled '<b>Supplementary Planning Documents</b>', <b>bullet 2</b> (p.7) -</li> </ul>	<p><i>'General consultation bodies – these include <u>town and parish councils</u>, local community or amenity groups, residents' associations, businesses, developers, landowners and other agencies.'</i></p> <p>Action: noted</p> <p>Noted: No changes proposed</p>
--	--	--	--

Appendix B: Summary of responses received to consultation on the Draft Statement of Community Involvement 2019

		<p>Workshops, which took place from time-to-time, prior to the publication of the 'Submission Version of the New Local Plan (2017)', were scheduled intermittently. No information relating to these workshops was placed directly in the public domain and it is not known how many were undertaken.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Under the section '<b>Consultation Principles for the Garden Town</b>' (p.8): Although reference is made to consultation with statutory consultees, no reference is made in relation to consultation with local parish and Town Councils.</li> <li>• Under the Section entitled '<b>Planning Proposals</b>' (p.9): Generally, it would be helpful if procedures and protocols for 'pre-application engagement' could be formulated in more detail. Perhaps these could be set out in a further document, to be included on the Council's website.</li> <li>• In the interest of transparency, more details of the Developer Forum would also be useful.</li> <li>• Under the Section '<b>The formal Planning Application Stage</b>' (p.12) - <b>The Application Stage - bullet 4</b>: Notification should also be made to local Town, and Parish, Councils. Since this is usually achieved by emailing a copy of the 'Weekly List' to them, it would be helpful to specify this, perhaps as follows:</li> </ul>	<p>Action: move this section so that it follows on from the bottom of page 5</p> <p>The Council has not consulted on any Supplementary Planning Documents – no change proposed</p> <p>Action: Amend 1<sup>st</sup> bullet point on page 8 as follow</p> <p><i>'We will consult statutory consultees, and as appropriate, engage as proactively as possible with relevant local stakeholders and the community (including town and parish councils) in and around the Garden Town, including across District boundaries. The extent of consultation will reflect the scope of a proposal or document.'</i></p> <p>Developer Forum terms of reference and minutes are available on the Council's website</p>
--	--	--	--

Appendix B: Summary of responses received to consultation on the Draft Statement of Community Involvement 2019

		<p><i>“Weekly Lists of planning applications submitted will be posted on the Council website, and forwarded by email to Town, and Parish, Councils”.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Given present changes to the reception area, information should be given as to how planning applications may be viewed at the Council’s Offices.</li> </ul>	<p><a href="https://www.eppingforestdc.gov.uk/planning-and-building/planning-policy/developer-forum/">https://www.eppingforestdc.gov.uk/planning-and-building/planning-policy/developer-forum/</a></p> <p>See changes proposed in earlier comments</p>
22	Karen Hingley (Framptons) – on behalf of Barwood Land	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provisions of SCI are reasonably onerous, will have the potential to negatively impact on timescales for the preparation and submission of planning applications and could consequently impact on the timely delivery of housing.</li> <li>Concerns that pre-app discussions will inevitably increase the timescales for submitting an app, potentially beyond that which could be considered reasonable.</li> </ul>	Noted but no changes proposed
23	Elizabeth Burn	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recommendation that, going forward, more is done to involve the respective communities.</li> <li>Must be appreciative of, and recognise the sensitivity of open green space.</li> </ul>	Noted but no changes proposed

Appendix B: Summary of responses received to consultation on the Draft Statement of Community Involvement 2019

24	Mary Dadd - ONPCG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Specific comments have been added to SCI (See PDF attached in email).</li> <li>• Should be more opportunity for communities to be listened to and participate at an early stage in the spirit of the Localism Act and the Neighbourhood Planning.</li> <li>• The Developers Forum looks after the developers' interests at early stages, but local communities have no input until after considerable planning expense has been involved.</li> <li>• Involvement for bodies (who ultimately make legally binding Planning Policies, and Development Orders) surrounding Neighbourhood Plans is 'light'.</li> </ul>	<p>Action: Amend para.1.15 as follow:</p> <p><i>'...Members of the public are informed via general publicity in the local newspaper, social media <u>and/or</u> the Council website.'</i></p> <p>Action: 3<sup>rd</sup> bullet in the text box on page 4 as follow:</p> <p><i>'...to ensure that the Council receives the relevant specialist <u>and local</u> opinions at an early Stage...'</i></p> <p>Action: Amend 1<sup>st</sup> bullet in the text box on page 7 as follow:</p> <p><i>'The Council will publicise the production of a new Supplementary Planning Document <del>or</del> in the local press, social media and the Council website.'</i></p> <p>Action: Amend 2<sup>nd</sup> bullet in the Application Stage text box on page 12 as follow:</p> <p><i>'All other types of development will be publicised with either a site notice <u>and/or</u> a neighbour notification.'</i></p>
25	Carina Powney	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SCI seems to be the bare minimum and consultation with the public is inadequate.</li> </ul>	Noted but no action required

Appendix B: Summary of responses received to consultation on the Draft Statement of Community Involvement 2019

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>District is facing extreme pressures on the environment and wildlife due to the demand to develop on the Green Belt. The public are not aware of the long-term implications of this.</li> </ul>	
26	Liam Lakes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SCI layout and ease of use of the document must be improved.</li> <li>Full legal review of document is required.</li> <li>Current process of engagement does not sufficiently take account of the needs of vulnerable groups.</li> <li>Consultation schedule is unrealistic and flawed.</li> <li>Draft SCI indicates that consultation is not mandatory. This is not strictly correct and in some cases, there are statutory requirements applicable.</li> <li>SCI document must include an outline of the steps that can be taken if someone feels that the correct process has not been followed.</li> <li>Reference to “learn from and improve consultation activities”. This is currently apparent from the way EFDC have and are handling planning decisions.</li> </ul>	<p>Action: Amend para 1.7 as follow:</p> <p><i>‘...The minimum requirements for public engagement in planning policy making is set out in <u>various legislation and regulations including the Town and Country Planning Act, the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act, the Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations, the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations, as well as relevant requirements set out under EU Directives.</u></i></p> <p>Action: Amend para.1.13 as follow:</p> <p><i>‘General consultation bodies – these include local community or amenity groups, residents’ associations, businesses, developers, landowners and other agencies. <u>In particular, the Council will seek to engage with hard-to-reach groups and vulnerable groups.</u></i></p> <p>Action: Add an additional sentence at the end of para.1.4 as follow:</p>

Appendix B: Summary of responses received to consultation on the Draft Statement of Community Involvement 2019

			<p><u>'...Please contact the Planning Policy Team if you feel that the correct process as set out in this SCI has not been followed.'</u></p>
--	--	--	---