

LEEDS CITY COUNCIL - Statement of Community Involvement : Reg28

Q No	Question	Representor comments	Officer comments	Suggested changes
Rep No: 0015 The Laurels Action Group				
503	Applicant/developer role	Residential Development etc., is a unit, a house, or a block of flats? Failure to undertake community involvement-applications should be refused from folk who fail to consult. Otherwise what's the point of 'community involvement'?	Government Regulations do not allow a Local Authority to refuse an application if consultation has not taken place. "Unit - Unit, in terms of residential, refers to a property - be it a flat, a house or a bungalow."	For purposes of clarity, LCC recommend adding 'Unit' to Glossary (Appendix 9):
504	Community involvement in planning apps	City Council should 'demand' not "encourage". Only applications have right of appeal. This is wrong! ALL those concerned with a development should have their say not just developers!	The Council cannot legally "demand" that developers undertake community involvement, although will strongly encourage them to do so. The rights of appeal are set out in statute and cannot be determined by the SCI.	No change proposed to SCI
C01	Other comments	Please also noted that I still think the document is too wordy and a bit vague in places.	Before publication the SCI will be checked by a plain English expert.	No change proposed to SCI
Q7a	Other community involvement initiatives	No		
Q7b	Who will be consulted	Yes		
Q7c	Timescale and accessibility	Yes		
Q7d	Suitable methods of consultation	Yes		
Q7e	Managing resources with appropriate consultation	No		
Q7f	Results of community involvement	No		
Q7g	Mechanisms for review	Yes		
Q7h	Policy for consultation on planning applications	No		
Q8	Written Rep or Attend Examination	Attend examination		
Q8a	Reason for attending examination	To ensure that the views of my community are adequately reflected.		

Rep No: 0020 Scholes Community Forum				
206	Community involvement	Omit words "have to". The sentence should read: The methods of consultation used will incorporate elements of both online and offline consultation.	Comment noted and agreed.	Revise SCI as requested.
303	Why needed?	Revise final sentence to read; 'Plans will reflect consultation, recognising they need to be "Taylor Made" to the needs of Communities.' Table text: Reduce Barriers-Resources must not constrain consultation, this is clearly recognised in section 2.6 the following revision is required: 'Documents for Major or Significant Planning Applications should be made available in Paper Format - to Community Groups, if so requested or by Elected Members of Leeds City Council.'	"Tailor Made" is the correct spelling, so no change required. Paper copies are available to view at selected local libraries and Parish/Town Council offices and at the Development Enquiry Centre. The Councils new computer system will allow details of all applications to be viewed via the Council's website. Given the improved availability of Planning Applications to copy or view the Council is reluctant to guarantee that paper copies will be provided. However, as far as resources permit, paper copies will be provided for free.	No change proposed to the SCI.
306	Measures taken involving those excluded	Amend wording "we will consider" to read: 'Favourable consideration will be given...'	This section refers to the Council's preparations for public consultation. The suggested change is not considered to be necessary as the sentence is already positive. However, changing the sentence to read "The Council will consider" adds clarity.	Change Para 3.6 to start "The Council will consider".
308	Comments received	Omit "As requested." If Consultees have made the effort to participate, we consider it courteous to send a summary by email or paper format, as soon as this becomes available; Alternatively "tick boxes" to enable opting in or out should be provided on ALL documents so that becomes a formality.	It is agreed that a 'Tick-Box' would be helpful on documents. A summary of consultations will be provided on the Council's website and sent via email/post as requested.	No change proposed to SCI
503	Applicant/developer role	This paragraph presents a MAJOR concern to Scholes Community Forum. Revision required is as follows: "Delegated decisions will NOT be taken when insufficient or no Community Involvement has occurred before application submission. Failure to consult will mean applications will only be considered by Elected Members of the Plans Panel who shall be notified of the absence or insufficiency of consultation." Add following text: "1). Developments involving demolition and/or sites identified in Planning guidance (PPG3.Annex C) 2). Developments which in the view of elected members require Increased Community Involvement."	The SCI cannot amend the provisions of the Officer Delegation Scheme. However, under the ODS, applications are already referred to Plans Panel where the proposal is of community significance and/or because of its impact or sensitivity and/or a local Ward Member so requests.	No change proposed to SCI.

Q No	Question	Representor comments	Officer comments	Suggested changes
504	Community involvement in planning apps	<p>Reconsideration of this issue is required; the intention of progress by electronic means is helpful. However recognising and in the context of Section 2 para 2.6. The procedure does not fully address the need to communicate with individuals who are not on-line or computer literate.</p> <p>Hence: Revisions or amendments to applications normally brought about by addressing objectors concerns may or may not fully satisfy the objection. They may well be a compromise, which subjectively the planning officer takes a view of, prior to recommendation - closer working within the spirit of the strategy is necessary.</p>	<p>In order for the Council to meet its responsibilities to make timely decisions on Planning Applications it is not possible to renotify objectors of amendments in every case. However, re-consultation will take place where new planning issues are raised. Existing services will still be available to customers who cannot access the internet.</p>	<p>No change proposed to the SCI</p>
602	Accessing consultation material	<p>Remove "Where possible" so that sentence reads "The Council will..."</p> <p>Add 'Providing the request for copies do not exceed six in number, Collection may be made from the Development Department enquiry desk.'</p>	<p>The Council needs to be mindful of resources whilst at the same time encourages participation in the planning process. The proposed wording change is not agreed as the SCI is already positive about providing paper copies. A reasonable number of copies of documents will be provided.</p>	<p>No change proposed to the SCI</p>
A06	Appendix six comments	<p>The pre-cursor statement is totally unacceptable - All major or significant applications and plans should be available at small libraries 'without special request': Delays already occur after requests are made and this leads to a loss of time for individuals to consider fully the implications of development. To overcome this problem our Community Group would be pleased to receive documentation which would offer the council to "piggy back" arrangement ensuring widest consultation is available within the statutory time frame.</p> <p>Amendment required: Plans and Application Documents classed as Major or Significant will be made available for inspection at a venue within 20 minutes walking distance of the application site or 30 minute public transport frequency.</p>	<p>The Council is developing its website so that in future it will be possible to view all applications via the internet, including at all local libraries and One Stop Centres.</p>	<p>No change proposed to SCI.</p>
C01	Other comments	<p>Relating to section 5 - The omission of matters relating to site visits.</p> <p>Modification required, to include: 'When site visits are made by applicants accompanied by planning officers or Elected Members, Notification of such visits, and invitations to attend, should be made to Neighbourhood area residents, and interested community groups who have been consulted at the pre-application stage or have submitted a written objection.'</p>	<p>There is no provision in the site visit protocol for inviting interested parties. However, representations can be made to speak at relevant Plans Panel.</p>	<p>No change proposed to SCI.</p>

Q No	Question	Representor comments	Officer comments	Suggested changes
Q6	Raised the subject of representation before?	No		
Q6a	If No, why?	As noted in pre-submission statement Scholes Community Forum was formed early in 2006. Representations were made personally on behalf of the forum and now the forum itself wishes to register concerns.		
Q7a	Other community involvement initiatives	Yes		
Q7b	Who will be consulted	Yes		
Q7c	Timescale and accessibility	No		
Q7d	Suitable methods of consultation	No		
Q7e	Managing resources with appropriate consultation	No		
Q7f	Results of community involvement	Yes		
Q7g	Mechanisms for review	Yes		
Q7h	Policy for consultation on planning applications	Yes		
Q8	Written Rep or Attend Examination	Attend examination		
Q8a	Reason for attending examination	To seek an inspectors recommendation that the SCI be modified to more accurately to reflect PPS1 and the current draft RSS. To ensure the SCI is sufficient for purpose.		

Rep No: 0023 Otley Conservation Task Force

403	What will LCC involve you in?	As well as consulting externally (Developers, the public, etc.) LCC Planning should make a determined effort to get other LCC departments to consult LCC Planning when making changes to their services provision. In Otley, for example, the Education Department's recent closure of a listed town centre school, LDA's demolition of a cinema in the conservation areas and Highway's treatment of road surfaces/markings have taken no cognisance of the historic environment because of these departments' unilaterate and insulate approach to their own services planning.	In preparing planning documents, relevant LCC departments are consulted. It is agreed that the SCI should provide clarity on the importance of consulting with other LCC departments.	Revise last sentence of Paragraph 3.5 (Section 3, Pg 10) to read: "...includes local people, business and others (including other LCC departments), that Leeds City Council will consult". Revise Appendix 3, 2nd paragraph after 'General consultation bodies' to read: "In addition, we will consult and engage with relevant Council departments, any other groups, stakeholders..."
405	How will LCC engage & consult on documents?	1. As well as consulting externally (Developers, the public, etc.) LCC Planning should make a determined effort to get other LCC departments to consult LCC Planning when making changes to their services provision. In Otley, for example, the Education Department's recent closure of a listed town centre school, LDA's demolition of a cinema in the conservation areas and Highway's treatment of road surfaces/markings have taken no cognisance of the historic environment because of these departments' unilaterate and insulate approach to their own services planning. This continues to bear no relationship to your own and national planning guidance, via: Otley Conservation Area Appraisal and PPG15. 2. I would ask you to make it clear that consultation must include internal LCC departments.	The importance of the Otley Conservation Area Appraisal is recognised and it is agreed that the appraisal is important for the consideration of planning applications. Otley Town Partnership and Leeds Civic Trust have been actively involved in consultation on the SCI. They are on the Council's database. Otley Conservation Task Force are also on the LDF database.	No change proposed to the SCI.
504	Community involvement in planning apps	1. Leeds Civic Trust has been omitted (plus equivalent bodies like ourselves in outlying areas of Leeds). 2. Otley Town Partnership not included.	The importance of the Otley Conservation Area Appraisal is recognised and it is agreed that the appraisal is important for the consideration of planning applications and at pre-application discussions.	No change proposed to the SCI.
Q6	Raised the subject of representation before?	No		
Q6a	If No, why?	The points made in Box 5 are additional to those raised at the earlier stage of consultation.		

Q No	Question	Representor comments	Officer comments	Suggested changes
Q7a	Other community involvement initiatives	Yes		
Q7b	Who will be consulted	Yes		
Q7c	Timescale and accessibility	Yes		
Q7d	Suitable methods of consultation	Yes		
Q7e	Managing resources with appropriate consultation	Yes		
Q7f	Results of community involvement	Yes		
Q7g	Mechanisms for review	Yes		
Q7h	Policy for consultation on planning applications	Yes		
Q8	Written Rep or Attend Examination	Written Representations		

Rep No: 0027 Clifford Parish Council

502	Consulting on planning applications	Parish Councils must continue to be sent all Planning Applications and should be advised of referrals to Plans Panel meetings and site visits where applicable. (LCC response to previous comment by Clifford PC - Question 7/0027 indicated that Parish Councils should receive weekly lists if planning applications)>	The Council will continue to send planning applications to Parish Councils. In the future all applications will be accessible via our website. This facility will also be able to monitor the progress of applications. There is no provision in the site visit protocol for inviting interested parties. Representations by interested parties can be heard by Plans Panel under the Public Speaking arrangements.	No change proposed to SCI
Q7b	Who will be consulted	Yes		
Q8	Written Rep or Attend Examination	Written Representations		

Rep No: 0038 Ramblers' Association, Leeds Group

A02	Appendix two comments	<p>Add Leeds Local Access Forum (LLAF) to the list of Key Consultation Structures and Organisations in Leeds. Reasons - The LLAF is a statutory body set up under the Countryside and Rights of Way (CRoW) Act 2000 to advise Leeds City Council and other bodies on strategic access and recreation issues generally and such matters as the Rights of Way Improvement Plan to be prepared by the local highway authority under Part II of CRoW Act 2000. Its membership includes representatives of users of local rights of way and land managers. The LLAF is therefore 'an established route for consultation and engagement within the Leeds area' (Para 1 under Existing consultation and Involvement Structures in Leeds on page 26 (App 2). This request to include the Local Access Forum was supported by the Countryside Agency (Representation 058) when it responded to the Regulation 26 Consultation. It is evident from LCC's comments on the Countryside Agency's representation that the LLAF is perceived to be the same as the Leeds Access Advisory Group, which comprise people who represent disabled people's organisations in Leeds. This is not the case.</p>	Comments noted.	<p>LCC recommend the inclusion of "Leeds Local Access Forum" to Appendix 2:</p> <p>"Leeds Local Access Forum - Under the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000, local and National Park authorities have a new duty to establish local access forums made up of representatives of users, landowners, and other local interests, such as conservation, tourism and business, as statutory advisory bodies on improving public access to land in their areas for all types of open air recreation".</p>
-----	------------------------------	--	-----------------	---

Q No	Question	Representor comments	Officer comments	Suggested changes
A03	Appendix three comments	<p>The inclusion of the Ramblers' Association in App3. Reasons- App4 of the pre-consultation Draft (Summer 2005) and App3 of the Public Consultation Draft (November 2005) included, under the heading of 'Other Groups', 'Groups which represent ramblers', walkers and cyclists'. We commented as follows in July 2005: 'The Rambler's Association welcomes the inclusion on page30 in the list of stakeholders to be consulted groups which represent rambler's, walkers and cyclists.'</p> <p>We note in App3 that the 'Other Groups include' heading of the Consultation Draft is now 'Other Consultees', and that the list of types of organisation in the Draft is now a list of specific organisations. The list does not include an organisation representing walkers. We therefore request that the Ramblers' Association is added to the list of 'Other Consultees' on pages 28 and 29. A further reason why the Ramblers Association should be included in this list is that, in addition to safeguarding the footpath network, another of its charitable objects is to protect the countryside so that walkers can enjoy its tranquillity and beauty. Consequently the RA would have an interest also in applications falling under the definitions of 'Major' and applications falling under the other definitions of 'Community Significance'. Furthermore, the RA's charitable objects are relevant to it also being consulted on DPDs and SPDs.</p>	Comments noted and agreed.	Amend Appendix 3 of the SCI to include reference to the Ramblers Association under 'Other Consultees'.
Q5	Changes necessary	Delete 'Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission for England' from the 'Other Consultees' list in Appendix 3. This organisation is already listed under 'Specific Consultation bodies' in Appendix 3.	Comment noted and agreed.	Delete reference to 'Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission' from 'Other Consultees' list in Appendix 3.
Q6	Raised the subject of representation before?	No		
Q6a	If No, why?	This duplication did not appear in previous drafts.		
Q7a	Other community involvement initiatives	Yes		
Q7b	Who will be consulted	Yes		
Q7c	Timescale and accessibility	Yes		
Q7d	Suitable methods of consultation	Yes		

Q No	Question	Representor comments	Officer comments	Suggested changes
Q7e	Managing resources with appropriate consultation	Yes		
Q7f	Results of community involvement	Yes		
Q7g	Mechanisms for review	Yes		
Q7h	Policy for consultation on planning applications	Yes		
Q8	Written Rep or Attend Examination	Written Representations		

Rep No: 0042 The Oulton Society

A09	Appendix nine comments	It is felt that recent development in the Oulton Conservation Area are not in keeping with the same and the area should be reviewed urgently as set out on page 39 under Conservation Area Appraisal.	There are no current plans to extend or review the Oulton Conservation Area. The Council's priority is to review CA's where development pressure is greatest. The concerns of the Oulton Society have been passed through to the Conservation Area Team, Sustainable Development Unit and will be considered when further reviews take place.	No change proposed to SCI
C01	Other comments	<p>Would like assurances in the SCI that the Society be kept fully informed on all matters relating to Planning, Telecommunications Masts, Traffic and the Environment as part of the overall community involvement.</p> <p>Present procedures work well and need retaining, but if future improvements can be made to streamline meetings and bureaucracy this would be welcomed.</p> <p>The document contains detailed and complex issues/procedures for the voluntary sector and the time required to be spent by local groups should be considered in relation to the work/time spent by full time paid officials and Civil Servants. Procedures must be kept simple and easy for such groups.</p> <p>We would appreciate a further two copies of the above document, and at least two copies of future correspondence.</p>	<p>The Oulton Society is on the database and will be informed of future developments in Oulton.</p> <p>The Council will, where possible, streamline consultation and meetings e.g.. through 'piggy backing' with other events as detailed in the SCI.</p> <p>We acknowledge the time involved by the voluntary sector and the SCI aims to keep procedures as simple as possible while taking account of the statutory process.</p> <p>Two copies of the SCI have been sent to the Society and the request for 2 copies of documents is noted.</p>	<p>No change proposed to SCI.</p> <p>Information added to database.</p>
Q7a	Other community involvement initiatives	Yes		
Q7b	Who will be consulted	Yes		
Q7c	Timescale and accessibility	Yes		
Q7d	Suitable methods of consultation	Yes		
Q7e	Managing resources with appropriate consultation	Yes		
Q7f	Results of community involvement	Yes		
Q7g	Mechanisms for review	Yes		

Q No	Question	Representor comments	Officer comments	Suggested changes
Q7h	Policy for consultation on planning applications	Yes		
Q8	Written Rep or Attend Examination	Written Representations		

Q No Question

Representor comments

Officer comments

Suggested changes

Rep No: 0046 Environment Agency

C01 **Other comments**

"The Environment Agency considers the document to be satisfactory and we have no further comments to make."

No amendments requested as support

None requested or proposed

Rep No: 0053**Stapleton Ltd**

301	What is SCI?	<p>The SCI should state that the Local Authority should not be allowed to enter into pre-application 'Co-operation agreements' and 'Development agreements' with developers (and third parties) that promise the use of Compulsory Purchase Powers years in advance of an actual CPO, and effectively give the developer exclusive development rights (e.g. as occurred in our experience through the Council's obligation in the agreement to not enter into any negotiations or talks with any other party for the development of an area). A Local Authority making such a CPO promise undermines the principles of the SCI by adversely affecting the community (specifically onsite residents and businesses) with development plans prior to a formal DPD or SPD consultation procedure and would clearly not adhere to the SCI set procedure for appropriate community involvement. Please refer to the accompanying evidence folder for a more detailed explanation and supporting documents.</p> <p>Also please refer to Test of Soundness iv) and v).</p>	<p>Each DPD is subject to independent examination - whether adequate consultation by the council has taken place is one of the tests of soundness the Inspector will look at.</p> <p>As regards SPD's, these are not subject to independent examination, but still have to demonstrate the 'soundness tests' - the consultation undertaken to be clearly outlined to relevant committees.</p> <p>The objection stems from individual experience on a particular SPD, and in particular the Compulsory Purchase Order (CPO) process.</p> <p>The LDF process cannot stymie development before a DPD/SPD is produced - planning applications can be submitted at any time, but the production of a SPD/DPD would be a 'material consideration' to be taken into account in determining applications.</p> <p>No change to SCI proposed as it is considered that the soundness tests will examine whether consultation on a particular DPD or SPD is adequate. As regards planning applications, the SCI does clearly state that the onus is on the developer to consult the public.</p>	No change proposed to the SCI.
603	Funding consultation exercises	<p>The SCI states that for major applications the pre-application consultation procedure will be handed over to the developer. Therefore the SCI must state what monitoring provisions will be in place for the Council to verify the accuracy of such achievements. This is especially the case when the Council has entered into pre-application 'Co-operation agreements' promising the use of Compulsory Purchase Powers years in advance of an actual CPO. Without this monitoring and verifying provision by the Council (which should preferably include direct contact between the Council and relevant parties), developers are able to ignore various important stakeholders with the result that it is improperly and irresponsibly claimed at a later date that proper consultations or negotiations have taken place. This was the case in our experience with the Eastgate and Harewood proposals.</p> <p>Please refer to the accompanying evidence folder for a more detailed explanation and supporting documents.</p> <p>Also please refer to Test of Soundness iv) and vi).</p>	<p>The SCI strongly encourages developers to enter into pre-application consultation with local communities. The Council will assist in facilitating that process and will advise on the standards for consultation that would be appropriate. The Council will strongly encourage applicants to submit a statement of community involvement as part of the application submission which will be open to public scrutiny and further public comment. As the process for pre-application consultation is not prescriptive or mandatory, it would not be appropriate to formally validate it. However, details of community involvement will be recorded in the officer's report which will inform the decision.</p>	No change proposed to the SCI

Q No	Question	Representor comments	Officer comments	Suggested changes
A01	Appendix one comments	<p>The SCI should clearly state that when producing Consultation Statement documents for/in SPDs and DPDs, only consultation undertaken directly by the Council should be included and should not include statements concerning consultation that has been undertaken by third parties (e.g. developers with 'co-operation agreements' with the Local Authority) for which the Council cannot properly verify (in terms of accuracy) or take any responsibility for, and then credit itself with this achievement. To do so would allow potentially inaccurate information to be present in SPDs and DPDs. An example of this is the Eastgate and Harewood Quarter SPD. Please refer to the accompanying evidence folder for a more detailed explanation and supporting documents.</p> <p>Also please refer to Test of Soundness v) and vii).</p>	<p>Each DPD is subject to independent examination - whether adequate consultation has taken place is one of the tests of soundness the Inspector will look at. As regards SPD's, these are not subject to independent examination, but still have to demonstrate the 'soundness tests' - the consultation undertaken to be clearly outlined to relevant committees.</p> <p>The objection stems from individual experience on a particular SPD and, in particular, the Compulsory Purchase Order (CPO) process.</p> <p>Use of consultants, where appropriate, by the Council is accepted practice, but, soundness tests still apply.</p>	<p>No change to SCI proposed as it is considered that the soundness tests will examine whether consultation on a particular DPD or SPD is adequate.</p>
A04	Appendix four comments	<p>The SCI should clearly state that when producing Consultation Statement documents for/in SPDs and DPDs, only consultation undertaken directly by the Council should be included and should not include statements concerning consultation that has been undertaken by third parties (e.g. developers with 'co-operation agreements' with the Local Authority) for which the Council cannot properly verify (in terms of accuracy) or take any responsibility for, and then credit itself with this achievement. To do so would allow potentially inaccurate information to be present in SPDs and DPDs. An example of this is the Eastgate and Harewood Quarter SPD. Please refer to the accompanying evidence folder for a more detailed explanation and supporting documents.</p> <p>Also please refer to Test of Soundness v) and vii).</p>	<p>Each DPD is subject to independent examination - whether adequate consultation has taken place is one of the tests of soundness the Inspector will look at. As regards SPD's, these are not subject to independent examination, but still have to demonstrate the 'soundness tests' - the consultation undertaken to be clearly outlined to relevant committees.</p> <p>The objection stems from individual experience on a particular SPD, and in particular, the Compulsory Purchase Order (CPO) process.</p> <p>Use of consultants, where appropriate, by the Council, is accepted practice, but soundness tests still apply.</p>	<p>No change to SCI proposed as it is considered that the soundness tests will examine whether consultation on a particular DPD or SPD is adequate.</p>

Q No	Question	Representor comments	Officer comments	Suggested changes
A05	Appendix five comments	The SCI should clearly state that when producing Consultation Statement documents for/in SPDs and DPDs, only consultation undertaken directly by the Council should be included and should not include statements concerning consultation that has been undertaken by third parties (e.g. developers with 'co-operation agreements' with the Local Authority) for which the Council cannot properly verify (in terms of accuracy) or take any responsibility for, and then credit itself with this achievement. To do so would allow potentially inaccurate information to be present in SPDs and DPDs. An example of this is the Eastgate and Harewood Quarter SPD. Please refer to the accompanying evidence folder for a more detailed explanation and supporting documents. Also please refer to Test of Soundness v) and vii).	Each DPD is subject to independent examination - whether adequate consultation has taken place is one of the tests of soundness the Inspector will look at. As regards SPD's, these are not subject to independent examination, but still have to demonstrate the 'soundness tests' - the consultation undertaken to be clearly outlined to relevant committees. The objection stems from individual experience on a particular SPD, and in particular, the Compulsory Purchase Order (CPO) process. Use of consultants, where appropriate, by the Council is accepted practice, but as explained above, soundness tests still apply.	No change to SCI proposed as it is considered that the soundness tests will examine whether consultation on a particular DPD or SPD is adequate.
Q6	Raised the subject of representation before?	Yes		
Q6a	If No, why?	Comments were made to the Council at the draft SCI consultation stage in December 2005. However, some comments were not fully understood, as the Council replied stating that they did not know what our comments were referring to. A follow up email was then made to the Development Department (ldf@leeds.gov.uk) on 16 March 2006 to clarify the comments and a request for a proper reply from the Council. There was no reply to this email. This matter was followed up, along with other matters, in a letter to the Development Department on 2 April 2006, and again this point concerning the SCI was not addressed in the Council's reply.		
Q7c	Timescale and accessibility	No		
Q7d	Suitable methods of consultation	No		
Q7e	Managing resources with appropriate consultation	No		
Q7f	Results of community involvement	No		
Q7h	Policy for consultation on planning applications	Yes		

Q No	Question	Representor comments	Officer comments	Suggested changes
Q8	Written Rep or Attend Examination	Written Representations		
Q8a	Reason for attending examination	Why we feel that in this case written representation is more appropriate we would be pleased to attend the examination if invited by the Inspector.		

Rep No: 0054 Royal Mail Property Holdings (via Sanderson Weatherall)			
A03	Appendix three comments	Appendix 3 referred to Post Office Property Holdings. We would be grateful if you could amend the document and refer any future correspondence to Royal Mail Property Holdings.	Agreed In Appendix 3 replace "Post Office Property Holdings" with "Royal Mail Property Holdings".
Q6	Raised the subject of representation before?	No	
Q6a	If No, why?	New to organisation. Were not involved with client at the preparation stages.	
Q7a	Other community involvement initiatives	Yes	
Q7b	Who will be consulted	Yes	
Q7c	Timescale and accessibility	Yes	
Q7d	Suitable methods of consultation	Yes	
Q7e	Managing resources with appropriate consultation	Yes	
Q7f	Results of community involvement	Yes	
Q7g	Mechanisms for review	Yes	
Q7h	Policy for consultation on planning applications	Yes	
Q8	Written Rep or Attend Examination	Written Rep	

Rep No: 0060 Highways Agency

503	Applicant/developer role	The definition for 'major' development has been questioned in the Leeds City Centre Area Action Plan under the Growth and Success section, where consultees are asked what they see major development is. The Department for Transport and the Highways Agency classes Major development by its location and in turn its effects on the transport network, the Strategic and Trunk Road Network in the Agency's case.	"Major" development as set out in Section 5 of the SCI is defined by the Town & Country Planning (General Development Procedure) Order 1995. This definition is used when assessing the type of development proposed by a planning application, rather than the definition adopted by the Department for Transport and the Highways Agency. By their nature and scale, major developments are considered in terms of their transport requirements.	No change proposed to SCI
504	Community involvement in planning apps	I would like to see the word 'stakeholders' added after where the first paragraph states "effective methods for consulting the community..."	By reference, the "community" are "stakeholders" in the planning process and it is not necessary to add "stakeholders" to this sentence.	No change proposed to SCI
A03	Appendix three comments	The Strategic Rail Authority is mentioned. This needs to be deleted, as this body no longer exists.	Agreed	Delete reference to "Strategic Rail Authority" from Appendix 3
A04	Appendix four comments	Suggest this could be clearer regarding timescales and dates for consultation, i.e. referring to the Local Development Scheme for example.	Appendix 4 sets out the process for preparing DPDs (as does Appendix 5 for SPDs). The purpose of these Appendices is to provide a guide rather than being overly prescriptive in terms of timescales and dates for consultation, however it is a helpful suggestion to make reference to the LDS for the programme of each stages of the process of preparing DPDs and SPDs.	After the last sentence at the beginning of Appendix 4 and 5, insert "The Local Development Scheme (LDS) sets out the timescale for the key stages in the production of each DPD" [or each SPD" for Appendix 5].

Rep No: 0062 Leeds Civic Trust				
301	What is SCI?	This section relates to the Outlines and Principles as far as the SCI applies to the preparation of documents by LCC and, to that end, is well set out and clear. However, it makes little reference to the principles which apply to ensure that there is full community engagement in the consideration of planning applications.	It is acknowledged that Section 3 does not refer specifically to community engagement on planning applications. However, the general principles set out in this section apply to applications in the same way as with DPDs or SPDs. Section 5 provides more guidance on planning applications and sets out consultation methods to be used for major and community significant applications.	No change proposed to the SCI
405	How will LCC engage & consult on documents?	It is stated that existing SPGs are to be 'saved for 3 years' until September 2007 but this is likely to be less than one year after adoption of the SCI. Given that a number of these documents were the subject of extensive community consultation, it is felt that these could be recognised more formally within the LDS. It would be unfortunate if this past community involvement were to be not given full consideration in determining planning applications after September 2007 and before any replacement SPD can be prepared - given pressures on LCC, this could be some time. This point has been made by a number of the Leeds Civic Trust's affiliated societies who have been involved in the preparation of V/NDSs.	There is no formal provision within the planning guidelines (PPS12) for saving SPGs beyond 3 years. However SPGs which are linked to a saved policy from the UDP will be retained as non-statutory guidance which will be a material consideration in the determination of planning applications.	No change proposed to the SCI
408	What SPDs are currently being produced?	Reference is made to the LDS and the programme to produce DPDs and SPGs - however, this is already significantly delayed and material on the Council's website is not up to date. If the SCI is to be the valuable tool it should be, it is essential that supportive material is as current as possible.	The LDS has been revised and is awaiting Government Office approval. Comment noted regarding information on the website. It is important that the consultation material is kept up to date and that the relevant stages of consultation on the DPDs and SPDs are reported correctly.	No change proposed to the SCI.
503	Applicant/developer role	In the last paragraph on page 16 (Before a planning application is submitted) there is a potential for misunderstanding as to the extent of pre-application consultation. Does the last statement refer to the need to enter into a pre-application agreement as to the extent of consultation required or to the extent of pre-application consultation that will be undertaken? Is it the agreement that is needed before the application or the consultation? In the list of approaches to be adopted, is there a mechanism for applicants to publicise on the Council's website - or provide links to their own sites? There is also no definition of 'local community organisations' here or in the Glossary. Notwithstanding points above, this section is significantly improved over the draft.	The Council cannot require pre-application consultation to be undertaken by an applicant. The purpose of this paragraph is to highlight that the applicant should enter into pre-application discussion with the City Council to agree the form of consultation which will be undertaken by the applicant before the application is submitted. There is not currently a mechanism for applicants to advertise on the Council's website. However, the Council is currently developing the website and applications will soon be available to view on the website. A definition of local community organisations will be provided in the glossary	Provide definition of local community organisations in the glossary in Appendix 9

Q No	Question	Representor comments	Officer comments	Suggested changes
504	Community involvement in planning apps	<p>In the section on 'commenting on applications' it is stated that the Council specifies a period of 28 days from 'date of posting' - posting of letters, 'posting' of application details on the website or registration of application? Although a definition of these dates may be part of more detailed material to be prepared in due course, the timescale is an important issue for voluntary groups who may need to respond speedily to ensure comments are made in a timely manner. It is also noted that Appendix 7 states that 21 days are allowed for written representations, a potential point of confusion.</p> <p>The LCT has significant concerns with the process for ensuring that stakeholders are notified about 'last minute' changes to planning applications before proposals are taken to Plans Panels. There have been occasions when letters notifying the LCT that a scheme is to be taken to a specific Panel meeting are received the day before the meeting - this does not allow time for a considered review of officers' reports or arranging to attend (if appropriate). If additional material is made available to the Plans Panel, this should be the subject of wider public consultation before a decision is made.</p>	<p>In order to provide clarity on the timescale we specify an actual date on the notifications and site notices, which is 28 days from the date of posting.</p> <p>We are improving our website so that in future planning applications can be tracked and amended plans viewed online, as soon as they are received.</p>	<p>Amend page 18 section 5.4 second paragraph replace "we specify 28 days" with "the Council specify a date which is 28 days"</p> <p>Appendix 7 - column titled 'Days for written representations' "21" should read "28"</p>

Q No	Question	Representor comments	Officer comments	Suggested changes
A01	Appendix one comments	<p>The following comments were made in our response to the Draft and were not taken forward:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1). A number of the stages set out in column 4 are not defined-what is 'consultation' with regard to a planning application? Many different opportunities to consult. 2). 'About Leeds'-this is not an appropriate vehicle for consultation in view of its infrequent publication-the edition delivered this week requested comments on documents (eg AVAAP) for which consultation period has already closed. 3). Surveys/questionnaires-these could also be used on major planning applications 4). Public meetings-these might be an appropriate way or informing communities of amendments to planning applications. 5). Workshops/PfR and Focus/Discussion groups-both or either could be used for pre application discussions or consultation. <p>Most of the above points were made in detailed comments on the Draft submitted to LCC. These were made on a marked-up version of the Draft SCI and, by agreement with LCC, it was accepted that it would not be necessary to include the many points of detail or drafting in the Reg28 Pre-Submission Consultation Statement.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Appendix 1 relates to DPDs and SPDs, it does not relate to planning applications, therefore it is not appropriate to make the suggested change. For clarity, the title of Appendix 1 should be revised as "Consultation and Participation Methods for DPDs and SPDs'. 2) "About Leeds" is one of the methods used to consult on emerging plans. Appendix 1 sets out the range of methods which can be used. It is agreed that the timing of the publication of the paper should be considered when plans are advertised. 3) - 5) As stated in 1) above, Appendix 1 relates to DPDs and SPDs. It is acknowledged that the methods identified by Leeds Civic Trust are equally applicable to planning applications which may be used as part of the methods already set out in Section 5 in relation to planning applications. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) 3) and, 5) Revise the title of Appendix 1 to "Consultation and Participation and Methods for DPDs and SPDs" 2) No change proposed to SCI
A04	Appendix four comments	<p>These set out the procedure for consultation on DPDs and SPGs very clearly. It is suggested that a similar diagram should be prepared for planning applications.</p>	<p>The procedures for how the Council publicises planning applications are set out in Appendix 7. The timings and type of other consultations undertaken by developers will vary and it is not wholly within the Council's control. It would not be possible to produce a diagram which typically sets out the process as the timings for all types of consultation in each case are likely to be different.</p>	<p>No change proposed to the SCI</p>
A05	Appendix five comments	<p>These set out the procedure for consultation on DPDs and SPGs very clearly. It is suggested that a similar diagram should be prepared for planning applications.</p>	<p>The procedures for how the Council publicises planning applications are set out in Appendix 7. The timings and type of other consultations undertaken by developers will vary and it is not wholly within the Council's control. It would not be possible to produce a diagram which typically sets out the process as the timings for all types of consultation in each case are likely to be different.</p>	<p>No change proposed to the SCI</p>
A07	Appendix seven comments	<p>As agreed with the Secretary of State, LCC informs the LCT of certain applications in Conservation Areas and affecting Listed Buildings. There will no doubt be other similar agreements with other specific stakeholders-should this policy be confirmed here?</p>	<p>Appendix 7 sets out the general baseline level of service which the Council offers. It would not be practicable in Appendix 7 to set out the detail of specific notifications and consultations with stakeholders and consultees.</p>	<p>No change proposed to the SCI</p>

Q No	Question	Representor comments	Officer comments	Suggested changes
Q6	Raised the subject of representation before?	No (to some points).		
Q6a	If No, why?	Section 4, Paragraph 4.5 did not appear in the Consultation Draft. Section 4, Paragraph 4.8 was not an issue at the time. Section 5, Paragraph 5.3 has been revised since the Consultation Draft. Section 5, Paragraph 5.4 did not appear in the Consultation Draft although similar points have been made previously. Appendix 7 did not appear in the Consultation Draft		
Q7a	Other community involvement initiatives	Yes		
Q7b	Who will be consulted	Yes		
Q7f	Results of community involvement	Yes		
Q7g	Mechanisms for review	Yes		
Q8	Written Rep or Attend Examination	Written Representations		

Rep No: 0084 Mobile Operators Association

501	LCC planning application service	We remain concerned regarding the Council's inclusion within the SCI to the reference of refusing applications or invalidating applications where they consider that concerns raised by the community have not been sufficiently addressed. We object to the inclusion of this reference and request that it be removed. We would hope that the establishment of a good working relationship between the operators and the Council's planning department through pre-application consultation process will negate the need for any such reference in the SCI.	Reference to 'refusing applications or invalidating applications' has been removed from the submission draft SCI. The SCI now states that the Council cannot refuse to accept a valid application if the applicant has not consulted with the community sufficiently. However, the SCI does highlight that failure of the applicant to consult could potentially lead to objections, which could be material to the determination of the application.	No change proposed to the SCI
-----	---	---	---	-------------------------------

Q No	Question	Representor comments	Officer comments	Suggested changes
503	Applicant/developer role	<p>1). With respect to the Council's consideration of our comments on its draft SCI, as contained in our letter 16 Dec 05, we note that "Telecommunications Masts" remains categorised as "Other Applications of Community Significance".</p> <p>2). We note the Council's comments that telecommunications masts are often matters of public concern and that the high level of consultation as prescribed for such developments in the SCI is consistent with the SCI objectives. It is further noted that the ODPM Good Practice Guide requires that there should be a high level of public consultation to accord with the objectives of the new planning system and that on this basis the Council SCI seeks a high level of consultation for telecommunications development.</p> <p>3). We further accept that pre-application consultation with the community and the Council planners often streamlines the application process by addressing unnecessary objections and by making suggested revisions to the proposal. Whilst we note that the Council accepts that the planning process is not the place for determining health safeguards we do remain concerned that by categorising Telecommunications Masts as "Applications of Community Significance" this may exacerbate the perception held by members of the general public that such development has a significance to the community thereby endorsing their perception of the health issues associated with such development.</p> <p>4). We reiterate our previous comments that the operators already generally undertake the consultation process as prescribed in the Council's SCI. We further welcome the views expressed by the Council's representatives at today's meeting that provided the operators comply with the Code of Best Practice they consider that this would be in accordance with the objectives in the SCI.</p>	<p>In section 5 we have identified examples of applications that can be regarded as potentially controversial. We acknowledge that the Good Practice Guide for telecommunications sets out high standards of public consultation and the Council acknowledges that this is normally undertaken. The SCI is not asking for any more than what is already undertaken in terms of public consultation. Health concerns are inevitably going to be raised as likely issues surrounding a telecommunication mast application. Now with all planning applications, decisions will be based on planning grounds. Planning Services are providing better information to the public which is clearer about the extent to which health concerns can be considered.</p>	<p>No change proposed to the SCI</p>

Q No	Question	Representor comments	Officer comments	Suggested changes
C01	Other comments	<p>We accept the Council's omission in consulting with the MOA or the operators in respect of its draft SCI, but thank you for the opportunity to make late comments in respect of the document and for further considering these comments and consulting with us on the current submission draft document. We welcome the Council's consultation with the MOA on matters relating to telecommunications as contained in its emerging local development documents and trust that the establishment of a good working relationship between the Council and the operators will be of benefit to both parties.</p>	<p>Further to the points raised by MOA, we acknowledge that reference to 'Telecommunications companies is not on the list of 'Specific Consultees' in Appendix 3.</p>	<p>Amend Appendix 3 to include "Relevant telecommunications companies" under 'Specific Consultees' .</p>

Q No Question

Representor comments

Officer comments

Suggested changes

Rep No: 0085

CAMRA

C01 **Other comments**

We hope that the place of the traditional pub can be recognised and enhanced in the overall vision for the Leeds Metropolitan District, both for the people of Leeds and for the heritage aspects.

This comments not directly relevant to the SCI but the importance of the traditional pub to Leeds is recognised. The consultation on City Centre Area Action Plan also