

Appendix B

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Question 1 – comments on the section relating to Planning Policy</b>	<b>Question 2 – comments on the section relating to Development Management</b>	<b>Question 3 – general comments</b>	<b>GBC response</b>
Burton Joyce Parish Council	<p>The value of a Neighbourhood Plan has been brought into question in terms of its influence in planning decision making. With no statutory obligation to take on board comments made by the Parish Council it remains a consultee as it did prior to the NP with concerns being no more than “considered”.</p> <p>The NP identified a need for smaller affordable housing but this is not being reflected in development approvals. Applications are deliberately staying below the 15 houses trigger.</p>			<p>This is a comment on the weight given to neighbourhood plans relates to the determination of planning applications rather than the wording of the SCI. . No change proposed.</p> <p>The issue raised concerning affordable housing relates to the determination of planning applications and not the SCI. No change proposed.</p> <p>Noted but the threshold for affordable housing is not an SCOI matter.</p>

Appendix B

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Question 1 – comments on the section relating to Planning Policy</b>	<b>Question 2 – comments on the section relating to Development Management</b>	<b>Question 3 – general comments</b>	<b>GBC response</b>
CPRE		<p>Limiting consultation at the pre-application stage is too narrow. Other organisations such as the Nottinghamshire CPRE and communities should be consulted early in the process. It should not be left to the applicants to carry out pre-application consultation as the local authority can be neutral. Early involvement minimizes the danger of community resentment later on.</p>		<p>The NPPF stresses the importance of providing pre-application advice which can help speed up the planning process. It is an opportunity for the LPA to identify issues early on particularly of a technical nature and hence consultation is normally limited to technical consultees. It is given on a non-prejudicial basis and does not bind the decision of the Planning Committee. The planning application will be subject to separate consultation including with the community in accord with the SCI. No change.</p>

Appendix B

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Question 1 – comments on the section relating to Planning Policy</b>	<b>Question 2 – comments on the section relating to Development Management</b>	<b>Question 3 – general comments</b>	<b>GBC response</b>
CPRE		GBC propose only to allow valid responses via the on-line system. This creates additional barriers to participation and excludes those without access to a computer. A simple e-mail address should be offered.		Preference is to receive comments via the on-line system , however, we will accept representations sent by e-mail or letter to the address set out in the SCI.
CPRE		The reference to the dedicated phone number for Development Management Services is welcomed.		Noted
Highways England	The SCI states that the Council shall consult appropriate organisations on Supplementary Planning Documents where development plans have the potential to affect the			Agreed

Appendix B

Respondent	Question 1 – comments on the section relating to Planning Policy	Question 2 – comments on the section relating to Development Management	Question 3 – general comments	GBC response
	integrity of the Strategic Road Network, Highways England should be consulted.			
Highways England		Support pre-application engagement. In Highways England experience pre-application discussions where appropriate provides the applicant with the opportunity to address concerns prior to the submission of the planning application.		Noted.
Local Councillor	Queries what is meant by the reference to “other consultees including the public as appropriate”			It may not be necessary to consult with every consultee depending on the nature of the planning application. However, it is proposed to clarify this point as follows: . Change the bullets

Appendix B

Respondent	Question 1 – comments on the section relating to Planning Policy	Question 2 – comments on the section relating to Development Management	Question 3 – general comments	GBC response
				<p>directly under paragraph 2.13 to:-</p> <p>For Development Plan Documents</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Statutory organisations including Councils, infrastructure providers and government bodies as legally required or those likely to have an interest;</li> <li>• Organisations representing local geographical, economic, social and other communities or those likely to have an interest;</li> <li>• Local businesses, voluntary and other organisations;</li> <li>• Others who have expressed an</li> </ul>

Appendix B

Respondent	Question 1 – comments on the section relating to Planning Policy	Question 2 – comments on the section relating to Development Management	Question 3 – general comments	GBC response
				<p>interest in the subject matter; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The general public.</li> </ul> <p>For Supplementary Planning Documents</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Statutory organisations<sup>1</sup> including councils, infrastructure providers and government bodies as legally required or those likely to have an interest;</li> <li>• Other consultees likely to have an interest;</li> <li>• The general public.</li> </ul>
Local Councillor		I am concerned under 3.3 that no reference is made to Parish Councils especially those with a		The NPPF stresses the importance of providing pre-application advice which can help speed

<sup>1</sup> Statutory consultees are listed in the regulations referenced above.

Appendix B

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Question 1 – comments on the section relating to Planning Policy</b>	<b>Question 2 – comments on the section relating to Development Management</b>	<b>Question 3 – general comments</b>	<b>GBC response</b>
		<p>Neighbourhood Plan. It seems to me that much is decided at the pre-application stage when the community has no input. What is sure is that there appears to be a dialogue between GBC and the applicant which leads to the applicant putting forward an application which they know GBC will support long before the public have to be involved!</p>		<p>up the planning process. It is an opportunity for the LPA to identify issues early on particularly of a technical nature and hence consultation is normally limited to technical consultees. Pre-application professional advice is given on an informal non-prejudicial basis and does not bind the decision of the Planning Committee. The planning application will be subject to separate consultation including with the Parish Councils in accord with the SCI. No change.</p>
Local Councillor		I have been told that the Parish Council		Speakers are restricted to

Appendix B

Respondent	Question 1 – comments on the section relating to Planning Policy	Question 2 – comments on the section relating to Development Management	Question 3 – general comments	GBC response
		<p>representatives cannot speak on behalf of their community but that is not mentioned in the draft. Hopefully if that is the case from now on they will have that right.</p>		<p>applicants, residents and residents associations and limited to people who have made written comments. A maximum of 3 minutes per speaker is allowed, unless extended at the Chair of the Committee's discretion.</p>
Local Councillor		<p>Greater clarity is needed regarding making a representation at a GBC council meeting in relation to speaking. Request that Parish Councils be notified of objections to planning applications raised by neighbours as practiced at N&amp;SDC.</p> <p>Request that notifications are sent</p>		<p>Notifying Parish Councils of objections by neighbours would be too onerous. A summary of objections are in the officer's report which is available to view on-line. Decision notices are also available on line. No change proposed.</p>



Appendix B

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Question 1 – comments on the section relating to Planning Policy</b>	<b>Question 2 – comments on the section relating to Development Management</b>	<b>Question 3 – general comments</b>	<b>GBC response</b>
		to the PC when decision notices are issued with access to stated conditions.		
Local Resident	OK	OK	OK	Noted.
Local Resident	Environmental protections should be given high priority – developers should be aware that plans should show where existing habitat is to be retained and incorporated into plans.			The Local Planning Document identifies biodiversity sites including Local Wildlife Sites and SSSIs are shown on the Policies Map which is available to developers to inform the preparation of planning applications. Information on Nature conservation and Geological sites is also available on the GBC webpage <sup>2</sup> under the heading Natural Environment. Policies protecting Nature Conservation sites are

<sup>2</sup> <http://www.gedling.gov.uk/resident/planningandbuildingcontrol/planningpolicy/>

Appendix B

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Question 1 – comments on the section relating to Planning Policy</b>	<b>Question 2 – comments on the section relating to Development Management</b>	<b>Question 3 – general comments</b>	<b>GBC response</b>
				<p>included in the Local Plan.</p> <p>Planning applications will be determined in accordance with the Local Plan. No change required.</p>
Local Resident	It would appear all areas are covered	Ditto	It is better to have community involvement, and whilst the document refers to “unheard groups” the Council must ensure that all residents of Gedling are able to comment in any way on proposals.	Noted.
Local Resident	Section 2.2 use of the word “may” in relation to producing a core strategy provides a let out and should be replaced by “will”			Paragraph 2.2 explains that development plan documents may include certain types of plans and Councils have a degree of choice over the types

Appendix B

Respondent	Question 1 – comments on the section relating to Planning Policy	Question 2 – comments on the section relating to Development Management	Question 3 – general comments	GBC response
				of plan they choose to prepare. However <b>agree</b> that the NPPF requires LPAs to produce development plans that must include strategic policies. <b>Agree</b> the SCI will be reworded to reflect guidance in paragraph 17 of the NPPF.
Local Resident		3.5 definition of neighbours is an issue and needs to be clearer for example a house behind could be on a different street.		Neighbouring properties are identified through the Development Management process as being any directly adjoining property to the proposed development site. No change required.
Local Resident			The statement generally makes good sense. Refers to local groups such as	Noted.

Appendix B

Respondent	Question 1 – comments on the section relating to Planning Policy	Question 2 – comments on the section relating to Development Management	Question 3 – general comments	GBC response
			Gedling Village Preservation Society, Friends of Gedling Country Park and Gedling House Woods who may have a view on local developments.	
Local Resident	No comments	No comments	Concerns about only one resident being allowed to speak. In the case of larger developments it is not always possible to agree who should speak greater flexibility is required over this. Likewise the three minute ruling on speaking needs looking at.	The principle that one speaker is allowed in support of the proposal and one against is considered good practice and one in common use. Speakers are restricted to applicants, residents and residents associations and limited to people who have made written comments. A maximum of 3 minutes per speaker is allowed, unless extended at the Chair

Appendix B

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Question 1 – comments on the section relating to Planning Policy</b>	<b>Question 2 – comments on the section relating to Development Management</b>	<b>Question 3 – general comments</b>	<b>GBC response</b>
				of the Committee’s discretion. The duration of three minutes is adequate to set out the key objections. If more than one person wishes to address the meeting, all parties with a common interest should normally agree who should represent them or split the three minutes between them. It is important to conduct business in a timely matter and no change required.
Local Resident	Section 2 strikes the right balance	No	No	Noted.
Local Resident	No comments	Historic England should be named as a relevant organisation where the application is within any wider	No comments	Regulations set out the requirements for consulting with Historic England in relation to Historic Parks and Listed

Appendix B

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Question 1 – comments on the section relating to Planning Policy</b>	<b>Question 2 – comments on the section relating to Development Management</b>	<b>Question 3 – general comments</b>	<b>GBC response</b>
		setting of Grade 2 Listed Building		Buildings. The proposal to consult Historic England on proposals within the wider setting of Grade II buildings is difficult to interpret as there is no accepted definition of what constitutes the “setting”. In any case it is not considered necessary and would be somewhat onerous. No change required.
		When amendments are negotiated which satisfies objections no further consultation will be undertaken. Parish Councils raising strong objection especially in relation to a material considerations within Conservation Areas have no involvement		It is for the decision maker to consider whether objections have been satisfied. Requests for further consultation would be considered on a case by case basis depending upon the nature of the amendments.

Appendix B

Respondent	Question 1 – comments on the section relating to Planning Policy	Question 2 – comments on the section relating to Development Management	Question 3 – general comments	GBC response
		in the negotiation process. There is no appeal process to an independent body for a PC to question the decision.		There is no appeal process to an independent body – a matter which is outside the scope of this document. However, complaints relating to the planning application process can be made to the Local Government Ombudsman. No change required.
Local Resident	No	No	No	Noted.
Local Resident	Nothing in section 2 refers to consulting on the removal of trees and hedges.	Pleased section 3.5 references nature conservation. However there is nothing specific on trees.	Quite a difficult read for anyone unfamiliar with the planning process. Opportunity to include trees under their own heading. They are not covered adequately by BREEAM standards nor does the TPO process give any protection (only 207	Accept the SCI should be more easily readable through removal of unnecessary jargon and explanation of terms in a glossary.  It is not felt necessary to have a separate section on trees as the document is

Appendix B

Respondent	Question 1 – comments on the section relating to Planning Policy	Question 2 – comments on the section relating to Development Management	Question 3 – general comments	GBC response
			trees covered in the whole area). Including a section specifically on trees will ensure developers are not given a green light for destroying trees.	intended to cover consultation on all development. Applications for work to trees protected by a TPO are posted on a site notice and a neighbour letter sent out. <b>Agree</b> to clarify this point by amending the table below paragraph 3.5.
Local Resident	No	No	Saw this on social media – surely contact should be made with local residents that will be impacted.	For planning applications, the SCI commits the Council to write to residents immediately adjoining a proposed development site.  In relation to plan making, in addition to site notices residents likely to be affected by a proposed site allocation would receive a letter.



Appendix B

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Question 1 – comments on the section relating to Planning Policy</b>	<b>Question 2 – comments on the section relating to Development Management</b>	<b>Question 3 – general comments</b>	<b>GBC response</b>
				No change required.
Local Resident			This response was recorded in section 6 of the feedback questionnaire. Despite having a Neighbourhood Plan for Calverton all Planning seems to respond to the landowners rather than the residents of the village, even after public meetings!	Paragraph 47 of the NPPF states that: Planning law requires that applications for planning permission be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The development plan includes the ACS, LPD and Neighbourhood Plan. Comments on planning applications are summarised and addressed in the officer's report. No change required.
Mellish RFC	No comments	No comments	No comments	Noted.

Appendix B

Respondent	Question 1 – comments on the section relating to Planning Policy	Question 2 – comments on the section relating to Development Management	Question 3 – general comments	GBC response
Natural England	We are supportive of the principle of meaningful and early engagement of the general community, community organisations and statutory bodies in local planning matters, both in terms of shaping policy.	We are supportive of the principle of meaningful and early engagement of the general community, community organisations and statutory bodies in local planning matters in participating in the process of determining planning applications.	All planning consultations are sent electronically to the central hub for our planning and development advisory service at the following address: <a href="mailto:consultations@naturalengland.org.uk">consultations@naturalengland.org.uk</a>	Support welcomed and consultation contact details noted.
Nottingham North and East CCG	Respondent assumes CCG is included in the statutory organisations however, health is not mentioned anywhere in the document.			It is confirmed that the CCG is included as a statutory consultee on the planning policy consultation database. No change required.
Nottingham North and East CCG		As set out in the Nottinghamshire Spatial Health Framework 2019 – 2022 – early engagement in the		<b>Agree.</b> Change the wording of the first bullet in paragraph 2.9 to read:

Appendix B

Respondent	Question 1 – comments on the section relating to Planning Policy	Question 2 – comments on the section relating to Development Management	Question 3 – general comments	GBC response
		<p>planning process is fundamental to ensure health and wellbeing is fully embedded and will enable the consideration of health/social care infrastructure requirements to meet the needs of the population.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Plans should be shaped by early, proportionate and effective engagement with communities, organisations, businesses and other consultees.</li> </ul>
<p>Nottingham North and East CCG</p>			<p>Healthcare contributions or planning is not clear in the document. We would like the CCG to be consulted on at the earliest possible stage for all applications over 25 dwellings direct to our generic estates inbox: <a href="mailto:noweccg.estates@nhs.net">noweccg.estates@nhs.net</a>.</p> <p>We would also like regular contact and</p>	<p>The Nottingham North and East CCG is consulted on all major planning applications which includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) 10 or more dwellings or where the site is 0.5 ha or more; and</li> <li>(b) for all other uses, floor space of 1000 sq. m or more or site area of 1 ha or more.</li> </ul>

Appendix B

Respondent	Question 1 – comments on the section relating to Planning Policy	Question 2 – comments on the section relating to Development Management	Question 3 – general comments	GBC response
			communications from the planning team and updates on status and triggers of previously requested S106 funds. Feel free to contact the team on the email address above with any queries.	<p>Planning applications can be tracked on the Council’s on-line system where officer reports and decision notices are publicly available. Weekly lists of planning applications are also available.</p> <p>The CCGs are encouraged to engage with the local plan preparation process at the earliest opportunity to make the case for developer contributions so that they can be identified in the local plan. No change required.</p>
Severn Trent	No objections	No objections	No objections	Noted.
Willow Farm Action Group			Need to ensure that planning jargon contained in the	<b>Agree</b> – include a glossary to the

Appendix B

Respondent	Question 1 – comments on the section relating to Planning Policy	Question 2 – comments on the section relating to Development Management	Question 3 – general comments	GBC response
			document is more clearly explained.	document and remove unnecessary jargon.
Willow Farm Action Group	The majority of the public are unlikely to know what a sustainability appraisal is.			<b>Agree</b> - include a definition in the proposed glossary.
Willow Farm Action Group	What is an overarching spatial vision.			<b>Agree</b> - include a definition in the proposed glossary.
Willow Farm Action Group	First bullet refers to “we will involve the public and consultees at the earliest opportunity. Prefers the wording at paragraph 16 of the NPPF which refers to “shaped by early proportionate and effective engagement between plan makers and communities.			<p>Agree reword paragraph 2.9 of the SCI to reflect NPPF paragraph 16 as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Plans should be shaped by early, proportionate and effective engagement with communities, organisations, businesses and</li> </ul>

Appendix B

Respondent	Question 1 – comments on the section relating to Planning Policy	Question 2 – comments on the section relating to Development Management	Question 3 – general comments	GBC response
				other consultees.
Willow Farm Action Group	NPPF paragraph 128 states that applicants should work closely with those affected by their proposals to evolve designs that take account of the community. Whilst this responsibility rests with the applicant the Ipa has an important role to play in facilitating/supporting this contact.			As the respondent states the onus is on the developer to engage with the community. The SCI commits the Council to encourage applicants to carry out early engagement with the community and this is considered sufficient. However, it is not possible to compel developers to carry out engagement. No change required.
Willow Farm Action Group	List of consultees appear sufficiently broad to cover all those likely to have a general interest in the plans.			Noted
Willow Farm Action Group	Bullet point refers to “we will write to			<b>Agree</b> change bullet point 4 under the

Appendix B

Respondent	Question 1 – comments on the section relating to Planning Policy	Question 2 – comments on the section relating to Development Management	Question 3 – general comments	GBC response
	<p>properties in the immediate vicinity of allocated sites and put up site notices around the site”. Should be widened to include those properties that will be directly affected by the allocated sites for example along an existing cul-de-sac to be used as an access road.</p>			<p>heading: <i>For Development Planning Documents</i> to read</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We will write to properties likely to be directly affected by an allocated site and put up site notices around the site.</li> </ul> <p>Repeat above wording for Supplementary Planning Documents.</p> <p>Please note for planning applications we will write to adjoining properties as set out in the SCI and required under the regulations. No change required.</p>

Appendix B

Respondent	Question 1 – comments on the section relating to Planning Policy	Question 2 – comments on the section relating to Development Management	Question 3 – general comments	GBC response
Willow Farm Action Group	Would like to see the retention of support in relation to the provision of flyers etc. to local community groups to deliver information.			<p><b>Agree</b> subject to this being at the discretion of the Service Manager for Planning Policy. Add new bullet:</p> <p>At the discretion of the Service Manager for Planning Policy we will give appropriate consultation documents to community groups, councils and statutory organisations;</p>
Willow Farm Action Group	LPA has an important role to play in facilitating contact between the developer and local residents – this should be included within this section.			The pre-application stage is set out in paragraph 3.3 of the SCI which states that that: for more significant applications discuss with applicants the need to engage with the community. This is



Appendix B

Respondent	Question 1 – comments on the section relating to Planning Policy	Question 2 – comments on the section relating to Development Management	Question 3 – general comments	GBC response
				considered sufficient. No change required.
Willow Farm Action Group		Section 3.3 - Pre-application stage – does not capture the essence of the NPPF paragraph 128 guidance with reference to applicants working closely with those affected by their proposals.		Pre-application advice is given on an informal basis and is often technical in nature. It is not practical to formally consult residents at this stage which would be very resource intensive. Consultation is undertaken in accordance with the regulations. No change required.
Willow Farm Action Group		4.4 - There is an over reliance on site notices a neighbour letter should always be sent.		It is normally the case that neighbour letters are sent to adjoining properties. However, sending letters in every case would be too onerous. No change required.
Willow Farm Action Group		The document includes reference to material planning		Agreed. A brief guide on “material considerations” will be

Appendix B

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Question 1 – comments on the section relating to Planning Policy</b>	<b>Question 2 – comments on the section relating to Development Management</b>	<b>Question 3 – general comments</b>	<b>GBC response</b>
		considerations, GBC should provide further guidance on material planning guidance on planning applications in a separate document/on line resource to assist. References to this guidance should be made in notification letters flyers etc.		attached as an appendix to the SCI. Proposed change include new Appendix 3.
Village Vision	No	No	No	Noted.