

**APPENDIX B**  
**COUNCIL'S SUGGESTED CHANGES**

REPRESENTATIONS MADE UNDER REGULATION 28  
CONSULTATION  
AND SUGGESTED CHANGES TO THE SCI

## REPRESENTATIONS MADE UNDER REGULATION 28 CONSULTATION AND SUGGESTED CHANGES TO THE SCI

The following table sets out the written representations made during the consultation period (Reg 28).

Representations received are listed by “Representor”. The questions, that appear in the table as Q No and Question are set out below:-

- Q1** Personal details
- Q2** Agent details (if applicable)
- Q3** Nature of representation. Support ; Object

For clarity, Questions 1-3 do not appear in the following table, other than the “representors” name and “representation number”.

- Q4** Which part of the SCI does your representation relate?
- Q5** Please give details of what change(s) you consider necessary to make the SCI better

For clarity, responses to these questions have been ordered by the paragraph/appendix to which they refer in the SCI document. In other words, the numbers **101 to 606** (under Q No, in the table) refer to the paragraph numbers in the SCI. For example 503 relates to Section 5, paragraph 5.3. Likewise A02 refers to Appendix 2.

Any other comments made are included under the reference **C01** “Other Comments” in the table.

- Q6** Did you raise the matter that is the subject of your representation with Leeds City Council earlier in the process of the preparation of the SCI, i.e. before it was submitted for examination?
- Q6a** If “no” can you briefly explain why you did not do so?
- Q7** The submission draft SCI will be tested by the Secretary of State on whether it is “sound”, in other words, does the SCI show “good judgement”, is it “able to be trusted”, and does it fulfil the expectations of legislation. Please consider the following statements and mark “yes” if you agree, or “no” if you disagree. Please leave blank if you do not know.

<b>Do you consider the SCI does the following:-</b>		<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>
7a	The SCI's strategy for community involvement links with other community involvement initiatives e.g. the Community Strategy: Vision for Leeds II	8	1
7b	The SCI sets out in general terms which local community groups and other bodies will be consulted	11	0
7c	The SCI sets out how the community and other bodies can be involved in a timely and accessible manner	7	5
7d	The methods of consultation set out in the SCI are suitable	7	4
7e	The SCI sets out that resources are will be managed effectively and will be appropriate to the level of consultation	6	4
7f	The SCI sets out how the results of community involvement will be fed into the preparation of development plan documents (DPDs) and supplementary planning documents (SPDs)	8	3
7g	The SCI sets out the mechanisms for reviewing the SCI	8	3
7h	The SCI clearly describes Leeds City Council's policy for consultation on planning applications	9	1

*As a summary, we have tallied the responses to each statement in the above table. Please note that not all of the 22 representors answered all / or part of Question 7.*

**Q8** Would you like your representation to be considered by written representation or do you consider it necessary to attend the Examination?

**Q8a** If you wish to attend the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary?

Please note that the Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt or hear those who have indicated that they wish to attend the examination.

LEEDS CITY COUNCIL - Statement of Community Involvement : Reg28

QNo	Question	Representor comments	Officer comments	Suggested changes
<b>Rep No:0015 The Laurels Action Group</b>				
503	<b>Applicant/developer role</b>	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	<b>Community involvement in planning apps</b>	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	<b>Other comments</b>	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	<b>Other community involvement initiatives</b>	No		
Q7b	<b>Who will be consulted</b>	Yes		
Q7c	<b>Timescale and accessibility</b>	Yes		
Q7d	<b>Suitable methods of consultation</b>	Yes		
Q7e	<b>Managing resources with appropriate consultation</b>	No		
Q7f	<b>Results of community involvement</b>	No		
Q7g	<b>Mechanisms for review</b>	Yes		
Q7h	<b>Policy for consultation on planning applications</b>	No		
Q8	<b>Written Rep or Attend Examination</b>	Attend examination		
Q8a	<b>Reason for attending examination</b>	To ensure that the views of my community are adequately reflected.		

QNo	Question	Representor comments	Officer comments	Suggested changes
<b>Rep No:0020 Scholes Community Forum</b>				
206	<b>Community involvement</b>	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	<b>Why needed?</b>	Revise final sentence to read; 'Plans will reflect	"Tailor Made" is the correct spelling, so no change	No change proposed

		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.'	required. Paper copies are available to view at selected local libraries and Parish/Town Council offices and at the Development Enquiry Centre. The Council's 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.	to the SCI.
306	<b>Measures taken involving those excluded</b>	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	<b>Comments received</b>	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	<b>Applicant/developer role</b>	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.
504	<b>Community involvement in planning apps</b>	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. Hence: Revisions or amendments to applications normally brought about by addressing objectors concerns may or may not fully satisfy the	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.	No change proposed to SCI

		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.		
602	<b>Accessing consultation material</b>	Remove "Where possible" so that sentence reads "The Council will..." Add 'Providing the request for copies do not exceed six in number, Collection may be made from the Development Department enquiry desk.'	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.	No change proposed to SCI
A06	<b>Appendix six comments</b>	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. 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.	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.	No change proposed to SCI.
C01	<b>Other comments</b>	Relating to section 5 - The omission of matters relating to site visits. 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.'	There is no provision in the site visit protocol for inviting interested parties. However, representations can be made to speak at relevant Plans Panel.	No change proposed to SCI.
Q6	<b>Raised the subject of representation before?</b>	No		
Q6a	<b>If No, why?</b>	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	<b>Other community involvement initiatives</b>	Yes		
Q7b	<b>Who will be consulted</b>	Yes		
Q7c	<b>Timescale and accessibility</b>	No		
Q7d	<b>Suitable methods of consultation</b>	No		
Q7e	<b>Managing resources with appropriate consultation</b>	No		
Q7f	<b>Results of community involvement</b>	Yes		
Q7g	<b>Mechanisms for review</b>	Yes		
Q7h	<b>Policy for consultation on planning apps</b>	Yes		
Q8	<b>Written Rep or Attend Examination</b>	Attend examination		
Q8a	<b>Reason for attending examination</b>	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.		

QNo	Question	Representor comments	Officer comments	Suggested changes
<b>Rep No: 0023 Otley Conservation Task Force</b>				
403	<b>What will LCC involve you in?</b>	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' unilliterate 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, 2 <sup>nd</sup> paragraph after 'General consultation bodies' to read: "In addition, we will consult and engage with relevant Council departments, any other groups, stakeholders..."
405	<b>How will LCC engage &amp;</b>	1. As well as consulting externally (Developers, the	The importance of the Otley Conservation Area Appraisal	No change proposed



	<b>consult on documents?</b>	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.	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.	to the SCI.
504	<b>Community involvement in planning apps</b>	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	<b>Raised the subject of representation before?</b>	No		
Q6a	<b>If No, why?</b>	The points made in Box 5 are additional to those raised at the earlier stage of consultation.		
Q7a	<b>Other community involvement initiatives</b>	Yes		
Q7b	<b>Who will be consulted</b>	Yes		
Q7c	<b>Timescale and accessibility</b>	Yes		
Q7d	<b>Suitable methods of consultation</b>	Yes		
Q7e	<b>Managing resources with appropriate consultation</b>	Yes		
Q7f	<b>Results of community involvement</b>	Yes		
Q7g	<b>Mechanisms for review</b>	Yes		
Q7h	<b>Policy for consultation on planning applications</b>	Yes		
Q8	<b>Written Rep or Attend Examination</b>	Written Representations		

QNo	Question	Representor comments	Officer comments	Suggested changes
<b>Rep No: 0027 Clifford Parish Council</b>				
502	<b>Consulting on planning applications</b>	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	<b>Who will be consulted</b>	Yes		
Q8	<b>Written Rep or Attend Examination</b>	Written Representations		

QNo	Question	Representor comments	Officer comments	Suggested changes
<b>Rep No:0038 Ramblers' Association, Leeds Group</b>				
A02	<b>Appendix two comments</b>	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.	Comments noted.	LCC recommend the inclusion of "Leeds Local Access Forum" to Appendix 2: "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".
A03	<b>Appendix three comments</b>	The inclusion of the Ramblers' Association in App3. Reasons- App4 of the pre-consultation Draft (Summer 2005) and App3 of the Public Consultation	Comments noted and agreed.	Amend Appendix 3 of the SCI to include reference to the

		<p>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.' 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>		Ramblers Association under 'Other Consultees'.
Q5	<b>Changes necessary</b>	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	<b>Raised the subject of representation before?</b>	No		
Q6a	<b>If No, why?</b>	This duplication did not appear in previous drafts.		
Q7a	<b>Other community involvement initiatives</b>	Yes		
Q7b	<b>Who will be consulted</b>	Yes		
Q7c	<b>Timescale and accessibility</b>	Yes		
Q7d	<b>Suitable methods of consultation</b>	Yes		
Q7e	<b>Managing resources with appropriate consultation</b>	Yes		
Q7f	<b>Results of community</b>	Yes		

	<b>involvement</b>			
Q7g	<b>Mechanisms for review</b>	Yes		
Q7h	<b>Policy for consultation on planning applications</b>	Yes		
Q8	<b>Written Rep or Attend Examination</b>	Written Representations		

QNo	Question	Representor comments	Officer comments	Suggested changes
-----	----------	----------------------	------------------	-------------------

**Rep No:0042 The Oulton Society**

A09	<b>Appendix nine comments</b>	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	<b>Other comments</b>	<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	<b>Other community involvement initiatives</b>	Yes		
Q7b	<b>Who will be consulted</b>	Yes		
Q7c	<b>Timescale and accessibility</b>	Yes		

Q7d	<b>Suitable methods of consultation</b>	Yes		
Q7e	<b>Managing resources with appropriate consultation</b>	Yes		
Q7f	<b>Results of community involvement</b>	Yes		
Q7g	<b>Mechanisms for review</b>	Yes		
Q7h	<b>Policy for consultation on planning applications</b>	Yes		
Q8	<b>Written Rep or Attend Examination</b>	Written Representations		

QNo	Question	Representor comments	Officer comments	Suggested changes
-----	----------	----------------------	------------------	-------------------

### Rep No:0046 Environment Agency

C01	<b>Other comments</b>	"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
-----	-----------------------	---	------------------------------------	----------------------------

QNo	Question	Representor comments	Officer comments	Suggested changes
-----	----------	----------------------	------------------	-------------------

### Rep No:0053 Stapleton Ltd

301	<b>What is SCI?</b>	The SCI should state that the Local Authority should not be allowed to enter into pre-application 'Cooperation 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. Also please refer to Test of Soundness iv) and v).	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. 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. 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. 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.	No change proposed to SCI.
603	<b>Funding consultation exercises</b>	The SCI states that for major applications the preapplication consultation procedure will be handed	The SCI strongly encourages developers to enter into preapplication consultation with local communities. The	No change proposed to SCI

		<p>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. Please refer to the accompanying evidence folder for a more detailed explanation and supporting documents. Also please refer to Test of Soundness iv) and vi).</p>	<p>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>	
A01	<b>Appendix one comments</b>	<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 'cooperation 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).</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. 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, 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	<b>Appendix four comments</b>	<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 'cooperation 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</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. 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</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>

		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).	Council, is accepted practice, but soundness tests still apply.	
A05	<b>Appendix five comments</b>	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 'cooperation 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	<b>Raised the subject of representation before?</b>	Yes		
Q6a	<b>If No, why?</b>	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	<b>Timescale and accessibility</b>	No		
Q7d	<b>Suitable methods of consultation</b>	No		
Q7e	<b>Managing resources with appropriate consultation</b>	No		
Q7f	<b>Results of community</b>	No		

	<b>involvement</b>			
Q7h	<b>Policy for consultation on planning applications</b>	Yes		
Q8	<b>Written Rep or Attend Examination</b>	Written Representations		
Q8a	<b>Reason for attending examination</b>	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.		

QNo	Question	Representor comments	Officer comments	Suggested changes
<b>Rep No:0054 Royal Mail Property Holdings (via Sanderson Weatherall)</b>				
A03	<b>Appendix three comments</b>	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	<b>Raised the subject of representation before?</b>	No		
Q6a	<b>If No, why?</b>	New to organisation. Were not involved with client at the preparation stages.		
Q7a	<b>Other community involvement initiatives</b>	Yes		
Q7b	<b>Who will be consulted</b>	Yes		
Q7c	<b>Timescale and accessibility</b>	Yes		
Q7d	<b>Suitable methods of consultation</b>	Yes		
Q7e	<b>Managing resources with appropriate consultation</b>	Yes		
Q7f	<b>Results of community involvement</b>	Yes		
Q7g	<b>Mechanisms for review</b>	Yes		
Q7h	<b>Policy for consultation on planning applications</b>	Yes		
Q8	<b>Written Rep or Attend Examination</b>	Written Rep		

QNo	Question	Representor comments	Officer comments	Suggested changes
<b>Rep No:0060 Highways Agency</b>				
503	<b>Applicant/developer role</b>	The definition for 'major' development has been questioned in the Leeds City Centre Area Action Plan under the Growth and Success section, where	"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	No change proposed to SCI



		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.	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.	
504	<b>Community involvement in planning apps</b>	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	<b>Appendix three comments</b>	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	<b>Appendix four comments</b>	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].

QNo	Question	Representor comments	Officer comments	Suggested changes
<b>Rep No:0062 Leeds Civic Trust</b>				
301	<b>What is SCI?</b>	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	<b>How will LCC engage &amp; consult on documents?</b>	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	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 SCI

		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/NDSSs.		
408	<b>What SPDs are currently being produced?</b>	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	<b>Applicant/developer role</b>	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
504	<b>Community involvement in planning apps</b>	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. 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	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. 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.	Amend page 18 section 5.4 second paragraph replace "we specify 28 days" with "the Council specify a date which is 28 days" Appendix 7 - column titled 'Days for written representations' "21" should read "28"

		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.		
A01	<b>Appendix one comments</b>	<p>The following comments were made in our response to the Draft and were not taken forward:</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>3). Surveys/questionnaires-these could also be used on major planning applications</p> <p>4). Public meetings-these might be an appropriate way or informing communities of amendments to planning applications.</p> <p>5). Workshops/PfR and Focus/Discussion groups both or either could be used for pre application discussions or consultation.</p> <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>	<p>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".</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>1) 3) and, 5) Revise the title of Appendix 1 to "Consultation and Participation and Methods for DPDs and SPDs"</p> <p>2) No change proposed to SCI</p>
A04	<b>Appendix four comments</b>	<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	<b>Appendix five comments</b>	<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</p>	<p>No change proposed to the SCI</p>

			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.	
A07	<b>Appendix seven comments</b>	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?	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.	No change proposed to the SCI
Q6	<b>Raised the subject of representation before?</b>	No (to some points).		
Q6a	<b>If No, why?</b>	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	<b>Other community involvement initiatives</b>	Yes		
Q7b	<b>Who will be consulted</b>	Yes		
Q7f	<b>Results of community involvement</b>	Yes		
Q7g	<b>Mechanisms for review</b>	Yes		
Q8	<b>Written Rep or Attend Examination</b>	Written Representations		

QNo	Question	Representor comments	Officer comments	Suggested changes
<b>Rep No: 0084 Mobile Operators Association</b>				
501	<b>LCC planning application service</b>	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 preapplication 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
503	<b>Applicant/developer role</b>	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	In section 5 we have identified examples of applications that can be regarded as potentially controversial. We acknowledge that the Good Practice Guide for	No change proposed to the SCI

		<p>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>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>	
C01	<b>Other comments</b>	<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</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>

		trust that the establishment of a good working relationship between the Council and the operators will be of benefit to both parties.		
--	--	---	--	--

QNo Question Representor comments Officer comments Suggested changes  
**Rep No:0085 CAMRA**

C01	<b>Other comments</b>	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 highlighted this and policies are being considered to protect public houses from changes to other uses.	No change proposed to SCI
-----	-----------------------	--	--	---------------------------

QNo Question Representor comments Officer comments Suggested changes  
**Rep No: 0086 Mr Frank Vickers**

504	<b>Community involvement in planning apps</b>	<p>Comments made in relation to consultation on planning applications, which are summarised below:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Definition of applications of community significance. The Planning Officer should decide if significant to the community by reference to planning history of site, special character, flats proposed, loss of trees, conservation areas/listed buildings and open space</li> <li>2) The Development Department could require applicants to erect sign boards on site advertising their contact details for information pack on proposals</li> <li>3) Will objectors need to endorse a developers consultation statement? The statement should demonstrate that the concerns of the community have been satisfied</li> <li>4) There are no sanctions against developers who fail to undertake community involvement. The SCI advised that this is not a material planning consideration</li> <li>5) Reference to 'failure to undertake community involvement' to avoid unnecessary objections at a later stage. There are no such things as unnecessary objections</li> <li>6) What effect will a report to Plans Panel stating insufficient community involvement have? The process of community involvement is voluntary. The SCI makes not reference to what will happen if the community have no interest in talking to the</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The definition of "community significance" includes all applications which may give rise to local controversy. It is not limited to the examples given</li> <li>2) It is agreed that the display of a site notice is an additional method for developers to notify local people</li> <li>3) The Council cannot require that objectors endorse the developers statement. However, it will be open to public scrutiny as part of the planning application package and can be the subject of further comment.</li> <li>4) It is correct that there are no sanctions, but there are strong incentives to involve the community including adding quality to the schemes.</li> <li>5) Agree that "unnecessary" is not an appropriate word. Replace with more appropriate wording.</li> <li>6) Agree that the Plans Panel reference needs further explanation, the text should reflect situations where the community have no interest and reflect situations where there are no objections.</li> <li>7) These matters are covered in the list of material planning considerations at page 18</li> <li>8) Agree this needs further explanation</li> <li>9) The SCI does allow for re-publicity where further material planning matters could arise. It is considered that meaningful community involvement will be achieved, whilst at the same time enabling the Council to fulfil its responsibilities for timely decision making</li> <li>10) Agree that further explanation on appeals should be included.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) No change proposed to the SCI</li> <li>2) Page 17 amend third bullet point as "Notify people by letter and/or site notice.."</li> <li>3) No change proposed to SCI</li> <li>4) Last paragraph of page 17, at the end of penultimate sentence add "..and to add quality to the scheme"</li> <li>5) Page 17 final paragraph penultimate para. Delete "unnecessary" and rephrase as "..is to avoid objections at a later stage on matters which could have been resolved earlier, which may cause delays.."</li> <li>6) Page 17 last paragraph last sentence replace</li> </ol>
-----	---	---	--	--

		<p>developer? The absence of objections can never mean that a proposal is automatically acceptable.</p> <p>7) There should be strong, clear guidelines protecting attractive residential area and improve less attractive areas. Needs to be greater emphasis on 'respect and enhance' and 'best use of land' is a matter of quality before quantity.</p> <p>8) Reference to 'an objection, even if made on good planning grounds, may not necessarily result in a refusal of planning permission'. This statement will puzzle members of the community. All material planning considerations have to be taken into account</p> <p>9) Revised plans should be subject to the same consultation procedures as the original plans. Where a developer wishes to discuss amendments to a scheme, the Planning Officer should waive the 8 week period, thereby giving time for consultation and consideration of the revised plans</p> <p>10) Concerned at their being no right of appeal for third parties. The SCI should make clear that the appeal process is separate from the application.</p>		<p>"when determining the application" with "who may wish to seek the views of the community on a material planning matter before making a decision on an application".</p> <p>Page 17 last paragraph first sentence delete "or not at all" and replace with "or not made reasonable attempts to consult" Page 17 last para. after second sentence insert "Likewise, the absence of objections does not necessarily mean the proposal will be acceptable".</p> <p>7) No change proposed to SCI</p> <p>8) Page 19 end of first sentence add "...when weighed against the overall benefits of the scheme"</p> <p>9) No change proposed to SCI</p> <p>10) Page 19 last paragraph after second paragraph "...although interested parties will be notified of any appeal and may make representations as part of the appeal process"</p>
Q6	<b>Raised the subject of representation before?</b>	No		
Q6a	<b>If No, why?</b>	My initial interest was in the inadequacy of SPG 'Neighbourhoods for Living'. My interest in the SCI		No change proposed to the SCI

		came about when I was concerned that 'neighbourhoods for Living' was not to be updated as part of the LDF.		
Q7b	<b>Who will be consulted</b>	Yes		
Q7c	<b>Timescale and accessibility</b>	Yes		
Q7d	<b>Suitable methods of consultation</b>	No		
Q7e	<b>Managing resources with appropriate consultation</b>	No		
Q7g	<b>Mechanisms for review</b>	No		
Q7h	<b>Policy for consultation on planning apps</b>	Yes		
Q8	<b>Written Rep or Attend</b>	Examination	Attend examination Request noted. Mr Vickers will be informed in due course of whether the SCI will be considered by public examination	No change proposed to the SCI
Q8a	<b>Reason for attending examination</b>	I would like to know if it is possible to attend the examination as an observer.	Request noted. Mr Vickers will be informed in due course of whether the SCI will be considered by public examination	No change proposed to the SCI

QNo	Question	Representor comments	Officer comments	Suggested changes
-----	----------	----------------------	------------------	-------------------

**Rep No: 0092 Home Builders Federation**

503	<b>Applicant/developer role</b>	<p>Reiterating comments from Reg 26 stage:</p> <p>a) Definition of community significance is subjective and the SCI should refer to that as part of preapplication discussions agreement should be reached about which category an application may fall into and agree an appropriate scale of community involvement that would be acceptable in order for the applicant to consider the most appropriate method .</p> <p>b) Section 5-concerned with the onerous nature of the list of requirements and approach a developer is expected to follow to pre-submission consultation.</p> <p>c) Pg 20-object strongly to LCC refusing to accept an application or refuse it based on the failure to submit a statement revealing that consultation has taken place. This sentence must be deleted. Quotes section 7.7.2 (pg 79) Companion Guide to PPS12.</p> <p>d) Appreciate the onus of community involvement at pre-application BUT, community views are not necessarily substantive or material. Each individual application should be dealt with on its own merits - sheer volume of objections does not warrant</p>	<p>a)The submission draft of the SCI (page 16) has already addressed this issue.</p> <p>b) The objective of the new planning system is to 'frontload' community consultation of proposed developments before applications are submitted. The SCI recognises that the level of community consultation should be guided by the nature of the development and likely community interest, it should not be seen as being overly-onerous process.</p> <p>c) The Reg28 draft has been revised to reflect Section 7.7.2 of the Companion Guide to PPS12</p> <p>d) Point understood, however it is important that the views of the community are considered in the determination of planning applications</p>	No change proposed to SCI
-----	---------------------------------	--	---	---------------------------



		withdrawal/refusal.		
603	<b>Funding consultation exercises</b>	Reiterating comments from Reg 26 stage: Section 6 - given the amount of applications LCC receive annually there would be considerable staff resource implications, especially if officers from Planning Services (pg 20) are to attend public consultation events. There is a concern that implications on staff resources have not been fully considered. Would welcome further reassurance that expectation can be realised.	It is accepted that the implications of the new planning system will place pressure on resources. This will be reviewed on a regular basis. Section 5 of the Submission draft states that Officers from Planning Services "could" be present at public meetings, however the onus will be on developers to organise and attend these events.	No change proposed to SCI.

QNo	Question	Representor comments	Officer comments	Suggested changes
<b>Rep No:0095 Government Office for Yorkshire and the Humber</b>				
504	<b>Community involvement in planning apps</b>	<p>It may be useful to set out the powers under which the delegation to decide planning applications is made.</p> <p>The SCI does not mention the role of the Government Office in the planning application process.</p>	Leeds City Council's Constitution sets out how the Council operates, how decisions are made and the procedures which are followed. It is agreed the SCI should make reference to the Council's Constitution and the role of the Government Office.	<p>LCC recommend the following changes for clarity to the SCI:</p> <p>Page 19: Determination of Planning Applications</p> <p>i) Additional text to be inserted "As set out in the Council's Constitution," before "Most decisions on Planning applications are made..."</p> <p>ii) Additional text to be inserted prior to last paragraph to read: "Exceptionally, an application may be called in for determination by the Secretary of State, where for example, it gives rise to planning policy issues which are of more than local significance". Link Change: Include "Council Constitution" in the Glossary on Page 39</p>

				<p>of the SCI.  "Constitution - Leeds City Council has agreed a new constitution (May 2006) which sets out how the Council operates, how decisions are made and the procedures which are followed to ensure that these are efficient, transparent and accountable to local people. Some of these processes are required by law, while others are a matter for the Council to choose. It can be viewed/ downloaded from the Leeds City Council Website, or alternatively you can contact the Governance Service Unit on (0113) 247 8408."</p>
A03	<b>Appendix three comments</b>	<p>The Government Office is aware that the Gypsies &amp; Travellers organisation Leeds GATE is a body which is known to the Council, with which it has developed links. We would suggest therefore, that it may be helpful if Leeds GATE is included in the list of Other Consultee Bodies. A reference to Gypsies could also be made in the 'hard to reach groups' sections which is also in App3 (ODPM Circular 01/2006 - Planning for Gypsies and Travellers Caravan Sites, Para 27-29)</p>	<p>It is recognised that 'Leeds GATE' is a body known to the Council. In addition the Council's Race Equality Advisory Forum (REAF) which is part of the Council's Equality Unit, supports a Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Group which meets approximately every 2 or 3 months. It invites officer representation from all departments. The database will provide a list of all known consultees and this will be regularly updated. It is agreed that Gypsies are people who are often excluded from the planning process.</p>	<p>Include 'Gypsies and Travellers' in the list of people who are often excluded from the planning process in Appendix 3. Linked changes Appendix 2: Add reference to Leeds Gypsy and traveller Exchange (GATE) . Add text to Leeds Race Equality Advisory Forum - "...development of Leeds. It services a Gypsy and Traveller</p>

				Accommodation Group".
C01	<b>Other comments</b>	There is no Monitoring and Review of the SCI. This should include statements covering: 1. what form of monitoring will trigger a review of the SCI 2. that the Annual Monitoring Report will also cover the effectiveness of the SCI 3. how often a full review will take place 4. that learning from experience will feed into the review process 5. that formal review of the SCI can only be undertaken by undergoing consultation and examination.	It is recognised that the effectiveness of consultation needs to undergo regular monitoring and evaluation to reflect best practice and achieve continued improvement. Section 3 of the SCI identifies that the monitoring of the success of the SCI will be included as part of the AMR. It is considered that the information provided in Section 3 is in line with the guidance contained in PPS12. This states that the SCI will only be revised if significant changes occur in the types of groups which the authority wishes to engage or different consultation techniques are to be employed. (Para 3.13, PPS12).The Council is unable to provide precise timescales on when the SCI will be reviewed.	No change proposed to the SCI
Q6	<b>Raised the subject of representation before?</b>	No		
Q6a	<b>If No, why?</b>	Misunderstanding		
Q7a	<b>Other community involvement initiatives</b>	Yes		
Q7b	<b>Who will be consulted</b>	Yes		
Q7c	<b>Timescale and accessibility</b>	Yes		
Q7d	<b>Suitable methods of consultation</b>	Yes		
Q7e	<b>Managing resources with appropriate consultation</b>	Yes		
Q7f	<b>Results of community involvement</b>	Yes		
Q7g	<b>Mechanisms for review</b>	No		
Q7h	<b>Policy for consultation on planning applications</b>	Yes		
Q8	<b>Written Rep or Attend Examination</b>	Written Representations		

QNo Question

Representor comments

Officer comments

Suggested changes

**Rep No:0099 English Heritage**

C01	<b>Other comments</b>	At this stage, we have no comments to make about its contents.		
-----	-----------------------	--	--	--

QNo	Question	Representor comments	Officer comments	Suggested changes
<b>Rep No:0111 Barwick in Elmet &amp; Scholes Parish Council</b>				
504	<b>Community involvement in planning apps</b>	The effectiveness of the proposals depends on LCC applying the principles and procedures. The Parish Council draws your attention to Section 5, which relates to Planning Applications, and in particular Item 5.4, 'Consulting on Revised Applications'. The Parish Council has, over the past few years, endeavoured to engage the local community when responding to contentious planning applications. Problems have arisen where late amendments are made and these are dealt with 'at the discretion of the planning officer' without further consultation. It is felt that 'discretion' should be clearly defined and not automatically authorised where applications are classed as 'major' or where considerable public concern has arisen as a result of an application. In these circumstances the Parish Council feels it should be re-notified and sufficient time allowed for further comment. Display on the LCC website alone is not sufficient, in the public interest.	In all cases comments received 2 days or more before a decision will be taken into account. It is considered these arrangements will achieve meaningful community involvement in planning proposals whilst enabling the Council to fulfil its statutory responsibility for making planning decisions in a timely manner. "Discretion" is qualified as being situations where the planning officer considers "further material planning matters could arise". In these exceptional cases re- notification is undertaken and a further time period is given	No change proposed to the SCI
AO6		The Parish Council has recently requested copies of contentious applications to be placed in Scholes Library, for the public to view. It is requested that Scholes Library, Station Road, Scholes, be added to the list of LCC Libraries holding planning applications.	It is not practicable to distribute plans to all libraries as many of the smaller libraries have limited opening hours which restricts public access. Special arrangements can be made for these smaller libraries on request. Leeds City Council are developing its website so that in the future it will be possible to view all planning applications.	No change proposed to SCI

QNo	Question	Representor comments	Officer comments	Suggested changes
<b>Rep No: 0116 East Keswick Parish Council</b>				
504	<b>Community involvement in planning apps</b>	In relation to a determination by the Plans Panel, it is stated that the report of the Officer's recommendation is "available for public inspection 5 days before the meeting". It does not say how the report is to be made available. In our opinion, it should be available 5 working days before the meeting and the report should be publicly available on the Leeds City Council website during this timescale. (Please refer to paragraph 4 under the heading determination of Planning Applications). In addition, the Planning Officer or Area Planning Manager's Report determining an application should be similarly available for public inspection on the	Officers reports and recommendations are now available on the Leeds City Council website and are available 5 working days prior to the Plans Panel meetings. These can be found on the Leeds website under Council and Democracy/Council meetings/Plans Panels/Reports. In the case of delegated reports these will be available to view on the website in the future.	No change proposed to the SCI

		LCC website 5 working days before determination.		
Q7a	<b>Other community involvement initiatives</b>	Yes		
Q7b	<b>Who will be consulted</b>	Yes		
Q7c	<b>Timescale and accessibility</b>	No		
Q7d	<b>Suitable methods of consultation</b>	Yes		
Q7e	<b>Managing resources with appropriate consultation</b>	Yes		
Q7f	<b>Results of community involvement</b>	Yes		
Q7g	<b>Mechanisms for review</b>	Yes		
Q7h	<b>Policy for consultation on planning applications</b>	Yes		
Q8	<b>Written Rep or Attend Examination</b>	Written Reps		

QNo	Question	Representor comments	Officer comments	Suggested changes
<b>Rep No:0586 Leeds Gypsy Traveller Exchange</b>				
205	<b>Communities in Leeds</b>	The list of ethnic minority groups includes no reference to known and long standing populations of Romany Gypsies and Irish Travellers.	The text in Section 2 (Para 2.5), of the submission draft SCI sets out an overview of the communities of Leeds. It does not represent the full picture of the population of Leeds. The Council does, however, recognise that there is a long standing population of Romany Gypsies and Irish Travellers in Leeds.	No change proposed to Section 2 in the SCI Linked changes: Appendix 2 (page 26) Add "Leeds Gate". Appendix 3 (page 29): Add "Gypsies and travellers" to the list of those groups often excluded from the planning process.
206	<b>Community involvement</b>	Poor literacy is recognised as one particular barrier experienced by the Romany Gypsy and Irish Traveller communities. There is a lack of substance in reference to resolving this barrier, clearly audio production of information should be considered. However, of greater concern is the almost total lack of experience of consulting with Gypsy and Traveller communities and no evaluation of consultation done. Within the new planning requirements, needs	It is acknowledged that poor literacy reduces the effectiveness of traditional written consultations and that more face-to-face consultation and visual and audio aides will help to deal with this issue. The SCI looks to promote and encourage methods of consultation that will be appropriate to the document being consulted upon and the resources available. The Council will provide information in audio format where appropriate and/ or on request.	No change proposed to the SCI

		assessment of Gypsies and Travellers is a requirement. Therefore should not particular reference be made to methods to address lack of capacity for this work.	It is acknowledged that the new Planning Legislation seeks a 'Needs Assessment of Gypsies and Travellers' (ODPM Circular 01/2006) and that early consultation is a necessary and important part of finding suitably located sites and reduce unauthorised encampments and developments. This work will be undertaken as part of the future production of a Gypsy and Traveller DPD. The Council has established a Gypsy and Traveller Liaison Group and LCC has good relations with Leeds GATE. Planning Aid will assist in consulting the Gypsy and Traveller communities on the progress of this "needs Assessment" work.	
306	<b>Measures taken involving those excluded</b>	The planning department has so far made no effort to build a meaningful dialogue with local Gypsy and Traveller representatives. Methodology for this should have been clearly mentioned in this section. This issue has ALREADY BEEN RAISED with the planning department. We have reminded the department that meaningful relationships need to start somewhere and not just at the last minute because some particular document requires it. LCC scrutiny panels have clearly identified that there is a problem. It seems to us that the planning department is satisfied to send us endless paper documents with no enquiry about our capacity to meaningfully relate the issues to a majority of the G/T communities. We do not have the capacity to do this and it is the department's obligation to support the building of that capacity. Current methods are meaningless.	We recognise that capacity for consultation is a key issue and that 'consultation overload' is a concern to many groups/individuals. The SCI encourages the use of involving the community in ways that are suitable to the document or issue under consideration. This will involve the use of methods other than the traditional written consultation where appropriate. The Race and Equality Advisory Forum service a Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Group on a 2-3 monthly basis. A member of the SCI team will attend the next meeting in September to discuss the issue of how meaningful consultation can be undertaken with the G/T community.	No Change proposed to the SCI
A01	<b>Appendix one comments</b>	The department has no knowledge whether any of these methods of community involvement are likely to be effective with Gypsies and Irish Travellers. We are aware of no enquiries made by the department to determine effective methods. We have facilitated a couple of focus groups for BME Housing research and similar and have found subsequent reports to be lacking in reflection of that input. Focus groups may be the best method but more evaluation of that needs to be done.	The SCI identifies various best practice methods of consultation. Each method of consultation will have different benefits for different sections of the community. The Council acknowledges that there is a learning curve for understanding the effectiveness of the methods identified and will regularly monitor and evaluate our involvement activities to ensure that the Council meet best practice standards and strive towards continual improvement. A member of the SCI team will be attending the next Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Group meeting and other meetings as appropriate in the future.	No change proposed to the SCI
A02	<b>Appendix two comments</b>	1).Given the specific requirements of the new development frameworks to include as yet unassessed needs of Gypsy and Traveller people it	'Leeds GATE' is a body known to the Council and will be referred to in Appendix 2 of the SCI.	Recommend including "Leeds GATE" in Appendix 2 (page 26).

		<p>is shocking that the list of local consultee organisations should not include Leeds Gypsy and Traveller Exchange which is a democratic group of national reputation.</p> <p>2).The list of 'people who are often excluded from the planning process' should in light of the particular requirements relating to Gypsies and Travellers, have included them as a sub-group of BME.</p>		<p>"Leeds GATE – Leeds Gypsy and Traveller exchange (GATE) is a community members association for Gypsies and travellers who live in, or resort to, Leeds. They are working to find ways for gypsies and travellers to get their voices heard."</p> <p>Linked change Appendix 2 (page 26): Add "It services a Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Group" to the end of the Leeds Race and Equality Advisory Forum".</p>
A03	<b>Appendix three comments</b>	<p>The list of consultee bodies makes no reference to the Northern Network of Travelling People, the largest regional grouping which is know to Government Office, Regional Assembly etc. The list mentions the 'Gypsy Council', there are three known organisations of that name. To which is the document referring. The list further mentions the defunct Traveller Law Reform Coalition.</p>	<p>The list of 'other consultees' in Appendix 3, including the 'Gypsy Council' and the 'Traveller Law Reform Coalition' has been duplicated from the guidance in PPS12, (Sept, 2004). Appendix 3 does not list all the Regional or Leeds based agencies/ organisations. However, the database of all known consultees provides the fuller picture and will be regularly monitored and updated.</p>	<p>Ensure that Leeds GATE and the Northern Network of Travelling People are added to the database.</p> <p>Linked Change: Recommend "Leeds Gate" is added to Appendix 2 and include "Gypsies and Travellers" in the list of people who are often excluded from the planning process, Appendix 3</p>
C01	<b>Other comments</b>	<p>There should have been much better consultation and communication throughout the process of drawing up the SCI document. This web form as a method of response is unwieldy and exclusive.</p>	<p>A number of consultation events were held across the city during November- December 2005 and were widely publicised. Some of the consultation events were targeted at specific groups, although the Council acknowledges that the Gypsy and Travellers community were not specifically targeted. Consultation material, including the comments form were available in paper</p>	<p>No change proposed to the SCI</p>

			copies as well as on the internet. These went to all Leeds libraries and one-stop centres. The comments regarding the internet are understood and the Council will look at ways in which this can be improved and made more user friendly.	
Q6a	<b>If No, why?</b>	No		
Q6b		Because I was not even informed of the existence of the SCI despite asking questions about it at relevant meetings and was not invited to comment or made aware of timetable for input.	The Leeds Gypsy Traveller Exchange will be consulted on future LDF documents.	N/A
Q7c	<b>Timescale and accessibility</b>	No		
Q7d	<b>Suitable methods of consultation</b>	No		
Q7f	<b>Results of community involvement</b>	No		
Q7g	<b>Mechanisms for review</b>	No		
Q8	<b>Written Rep or Attend Examination</b>	Written representations		

QNo	Question	Representor comments	Officer comments	Suggested changes
<b>Rep No: 0940 Yorkshire and Humber Assembly</b>				
C01	<b>Other comments</b>	"On this occasion, this is not a document the Assembly would wish to comment on."	Comments noted	No change proposed to SCI

QNo	Question	Representor comments	Officer comments	Suggested changes
<b>Rep No:2058 Countryside Agency</b>				
A02	<b>Appendix two comments</b>	...we welcome the inclusion of the Gypsy Council in the list of Other Consultees. To reiterate our previous comments though (Reg26 stage), we would welcome the inclusion of Leeds Local Access Forum to the list.	Leeds Local Access Forum is a recognised forum and will be added to the list of Key Consultation structures and organisations in Leeds (Appendix 2)	LCC recommend the inclusion of "Leeds Local Access Forum" to Appendix 2: "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".
A02	<b>Appendix two comments</b>	...we would again like to reiterate that Parish Plans represent a key way of involving and consulting with communities and should feed into the SCI where possible. The SCI should recognise the role of such documents in terms of key community tools.	It is acknowledged that Parish/Neighbourhood Plans, like Village Design Statements, provide an opportunity for the community to get involved in issues that affect their local area. Their production and status as a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) is subject to being identified in the three year rolling programme of the LDS. Where documents are not prepared under the statutory provisions for Local Development Documents, they will be considered as material to the consideration of some planning applications dependant on the circumstances of the case.	No change proposed to the SCI
A02	<b>Appendix two comments</b>	...we welcome the inclusion of the Gypsy Council in the list of Other Consultees. To reiterate our previous comments though (Reg26 stage), we would welcome the inclusion of Leeds Local Access Forum to the list.	Leeds Local Access Forum is a recognised forum and will be added to the list of Key Consultation structures and organisations in Leeds (Appendix 2)	LCC recommend the inclusion of "Leeds Local Access Forum" to Appendix 2: "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".

A02	<b>Appendix two comments</b>	...we would again like to reiterate that Parish Plans represent a key way of involving and consulting with communities and should feed into the SCI where possible. The SCI should recognise the role of such documents in terms of key community tools.	It is acknowledged that Parish/Neighbourhood Plans, like Village Design Statements, provide an opportunity for the community to get involved in issues that affect their local area. Their production and status as a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) is subject to being identified in the three year rolling programme of the LDS. Where documents are not prepared under the statutory provisions for Local Development Documents, they will be considered as material to the consideration of some planning applications dependant on the circumstances of the case.	No change proposed to the SCI
A09	<b>Appendix nine comments</b>	We also welcome the inclusion of explanatory text in the Glossary relating to VDS's and the information on page 13 on how communities can initiate SPD's.	Comments welcomed	No change proposed to the SCI
C01	<b>Other comments</b>	Given our priorities the Countryside Agency will not be making any additional response to the (Reg28) consultation document to those we made in our response in November 2005.	Comments noted	

MINOR SUGGESTED CHANGES TO SCI

## LEEDS CITY COUNCIL'S SUGGESTED CHANGES TO SUBMISSION DRAFT SCI

In addition to the representations received at Regulation 28 stage (Appendix C), Leeds City Council have noted a number of minor errors / suggested changes that would improve the SCI document:

PAGE	Section / Paragraph	Suggested Change
ALL SECTIONS		For purposes of clarity, numbering of paragraphs should be reviewed.
8, 10, 11, 12, 16, 17, 19	Sections 3/ 4 and 5	For clarity, the various references to “we” should be replaced with “Leeds City Council” or “The Council” as appropriate.
11	Section 3, paragraph 3.8	For purposes of clarity suggest amending paragraph to read: “After the involvement process a summary report will be made available to participants on request. These summary reports will be provided as either electronic or paper formats. These reports will also be made available on the Leeds City Council website, as well as through local libraries and the Development Enquiry centre ( 2 Rossington Street). All summary reports will...”
11	Section 3, paragraph 3.10	Omit “our” from first sentence.
26	Appendix 2	Re-insert “Leeds Access Advisory Group”. This group was included in early versions of the SCI. Its admission is an error. “Leeds Access Advisory Group – This group is made up of people who represent disabled people’s organisations in Leeds. The group has been used as a consultative body for a range of issues”.
30	Appendix 4; Boxes 2 and 3	“Scoring” should read “Scoping”
32	Appendix 5; Box 2	“Scoring” should read “Scoping”
33	Appendix 6	“Amlet” library. Should read “Armley”
35	Appendix 7- “Days for written representations”	“21”. Should read “28”