

Table showing the representations made to the draft Statement of Community Involvement, a summary of each representation and SBC's draft response

Given Name	Family Name	Company/ Organisation	Number	ID	Your opinion - Please state your opinion?	Original Consultee Comment	SBC summary of consultee response	SBC draft response to consultee comment
Caroline	Middleton		General Comments	SCI19		<p>Great idea to have consultation....IF it is ever listened to and acted upon.</p> <p>The recent public response to new road and housing proposals has been totally ignored....so I see this as a pointless exercise as the local council will do exactly what they want regardless of public views.</p>	<p>1. Great idea to have consultation but the recent public response to new road and housing proposals has been totally ignored.</p> <p>2. This is a pointless exercise as the local council will do exactly what they want regardless of public views.</p>	<p>1. Consultation does not necessarily lead to the outcome sought by respondents. However, the SCI does ensure that stakeholders' views are taken into account alongside other relevant issues. No change proposed. See above.</p> <p>2. No change proposed.</p>
Trevor	Hall	Kent Police	General Comments	SCI29		No Comment.	<p>1. No Comment.</p>	<p>1. Noted. No change proposed.</p>
S	Palmer		General Comments	SCI46		<p>There is never any publication of why the council deem a person's objections as over ridden or how they arrive at a refusal or acceptance of an application. This gives the impression that the comments submitted have been ignored.</p>	<p>1. Never any publication of why the Council deem an objection as over ridden or how they arrive at a refusal or acceptance of an application. Gives the impression that comments have been ignored.</p>	<p>1. All planning applications are considered by Planning Officers and a number are also considered by planning Committee. Objections, supports and observations are summarised in the report on each planning application and the report will then go on to discuss the merits or otherwise of the proposal. It would be impractical to respond to every comment as this would be too resource intensive. No change</p>

Given Name	Family Name	Company/ Organisation	Number	ID	Your opinion - Please state your opinion?	Original Consultee Comment	SBC summary of consultee response	SBC draft response to consultee comment
								proposed.
Katie	Miller	Kent Downs AONB	General Comments	SCI48		<p><u>Duty to Co-operate</u></p> <p>The AONB Unit would welcome the opportunity to be involved in Swale's Duty to Co-operate. The extent of the AONB means that this is a strategic cross boundary matter, with the AONB present in 10 District Councils in Kent as well as Medway Unitary Authority, including all the local authority areas that share a boundary with Swale. The AONB Unit would be well placed to advise on cross boundary impacts and our involvement would be consistent with guidance provided in the NPPG which advises that, among other matters, landscape areas may be a more appropriate basis on which to plan than individual local planning authority areas.</p> <p>As part of the Duty to co-operate process, it would be helpful to consider whether other local authorities should be asked to accommodate some of Swale's housing requirement due to environmental constraints in the Borough (i.e. AONB designation), in line with paragraphs 14 and 179 of the NPPF.</p> <p><u>Planning Application consultations</u></p> <p>The AONB Unit is not included as a consultee in Table 2 at para 4.16. While the AONB Unit is not a statutory consultee in respect of planning applications and would not wish to be consulted on all planning applications within the AONB (nor would we have the resources to be able to respond), the Unit would like to be consulted on any major proposals that lie</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The AONB Unit would like to be involved in Swale's Duty to Co-operate as the extent of the AONB means that this is a strategic cross boundary matter. Our involvement would be consistent with guidance provided in the NPPG which advises that, among other matters, landscape areas may be a more appropriate basis on which to plan than individual local planning authority areas. 2. It would be helpful to consider whether other local authorities should be asked to accommodate some of Swale's housing requirement due to environmental constraints in the Borough (i.e. AONB designation), in line with paragraphs 14 and 179 of the NPPF. 3. The AONB Unit is not included as a consultee in Table 2 at para 4.16. We are not a statutory consultee in respect of planning applications, but would like to be consulted on any major proposals that lie either within the AONB or within its setting. This is in accordance with the planning protocol that has been agreed with all the local authorities within the AONB. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The AONB is an inherent part of our Duty to Co-operate through the JAC and will continue to do so and they will be consulted directly on specific matters as they arise. No change proposed. 2. This will of course be a consideration once we have Swale's OAN figure after the Government's 'Planning for the Right Homes in the Right Places' is finalised after the recent consultation. No change proposed. 3. The AONB unit will be added in the column titled 'Non-statutory consultees.' Change proposed.

Given Name	Family Name	Company/ Organisation	Number	ID	Your opinion - Please state your opinion?	Original Consultee Comment	SBC summary of consultee response	SBC draft response to consultee comment
						<p>either within the AONB or within its setting. This is in accordance with the planning protocol that has been agreed with all the local authorities within the AONB. This states that the Unit will get involved in development management only in exceptional circumstances, for example in terms, of scale, precedence and cumulative effect. As specified in the protocol, the Unit will also provide advice on other planning applications at the request of a Planning Officer or Kent Downs AONB Joint Advisory Committee member.</p>		
Alan	Byrne	Historic England	General Comments	SCI50		<p>Thank you for your email of 20 October 2017 inviting comments on the above document. The consultation process detailed in the SCI should be adequate in meeting the requirements of the Local Development Regulations 2004.</p> <p>It will be important to ensure that stakeholder organisations with interests and responsibilities in the historic environment, at national and local levels, are fully involved throughout the consultation process. To this end, it is important to consult with both the Council's own conservation officer or team and local amenity societies. In terms of the general requirements of consultation in relation to the historic environment, I attach a Note on Consultation with the Heritage Sector and a list of national amenity bodies.</p> <p>Note on consultation with the Heritage Sector</p> <p>Under the Town and Country Planning (Local</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The consultation process detailed in the SCI should be adequate in meeting the requirements of the Local Development Regulations 2004. 2. Is important to ensure stakeholder organisations with interests and responsibilities in the historic environment, both national and local, are fully involved. Important to consult with the Council's conservation officer and local amenity societies. In terms of the general requirements of consultation in relation to the historic environment, attached is a Note on Consultation with the Heritage Sector and a list of national amenity bodies. 3. Under the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) Regulations 2004, Historic England is not specified as an authority that the Council must consult with on the preparation of a draft SCI 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noted. No change proposed. 2. Table 1 includes civic societies, cultural, historical and archaeological groups and bodies as other organisations to consult in the plan making process, as well as yourselves, so both national and local historic interests will be adequately covered. No change proposed. 3. Noted. No change proposed.

Given Name	Family Name	Company/ Organisation	Number	ID	Your opinion - Please state your opinion?	Original Consultee Comment	SBC summary of consultee response	SBC draft response to consultee comment
						Development) Regulations 2004, Historic England is not specified as an authority that the Council must consult with on the preparation of a draft SCI [Regulation 25 (2)]. However, as a statutory consultation body at other stages in the preparation of Development Plan Documents, as well certain planning applications, we welcome the opportunity to make general comments on the SCI.	[Regulation 25 (2)]. However, as a statutory consultation body at other stages in the preparation of Development Plan Documents, as well certain planning applications, we welcome the opportunity to make general comments on the SCI.	
Alan	Byrne	Historic England	General Comments	SCI54		<p>Consultation address database – It is no longer necessary to send any hard copy correspondence and documents relating to the Local Development Framework / Local Plan / Neighbourhood Development Plans / Supplementary Planning Documents to our South East Office. However, if sending consultations in paper form or as a hard disc (CD) the consultation should be sent to the regional office; Historic England South East, Eastgate Court, 195-205 High Street, GUILDFORD GU1 3EH. You may remove any other addresses for English Heritage or the Royal Commission on the Historical Monuments of England from your database.</p> <p>All electronic consultations, by email, should be sent to the dedicated consultation mailbox:e-seast@historicengland.org.uk. We would ask that consultations are not sent to any other mail addresses or email inboxes (including personal email inbox) as this will result in delays to registration and responses from Historic England.</p> <p>Sustainability Appraisal - Whilst Historic</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It is no longer necessary to send any hard copy correspondence and documents relating to the Local Development Framework / Local Plan / Neighbourhood Development Plans / Supplementary Planning Documents to our South East Office. If sending consultations in paper form or as a hard disc the consultation should be sent to the regional office; Historic England South East, Eastgate Court, 195-205 High Street, GUILDFORD GU1 3EH. 2. All electronic consultations should be sent to: e-seast@historicengland.org.uk. 3. Whilst Historic England is a statutory consultee for Strategic Environmental Assessment, we do not have the capacity to attend SEA/SA workshops. Workshops should be attended by your Conservation Officer and a representative from the County Council's archaeological service. We will respond to correspondence relating 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noted. Our consultation database has been updated. No change proposed. 2. Noted. Our consultation database has been updated. No change proposed. 3. Noted. No change proposed.

Given Name	Family Name	Company/ Organisation	Number	ID	Your opinion - Please state your opinion?	Original Consultee Comment	SBC summary of consultee response	SBC draft response to consultee comment
						<p>England is a statutory consultee for Strategic Environmental Assessment, we do not have the capacity to attend SEA/SA workshops. If it is proposed to hold such an event, you should ensure that your Conservation Officer and a representative from the County Council's archaeological service is invited to attend to be on any issues relating to the historic environment. We will, of course, respond to correspondence relating to SEA at the appropriate stages.</p>	<p>to SEA at the appropriate stages.</p>	
Natural	England	Natural England	General Comments	SCI57		<p>Thank you for your consultation on the above dated and received by Natural England on 20th October 2017.</p> <p>Natural England is a non-departmental public body. Our statutory purpose is to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development.</p> <p>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 and participating in the process of determining planning applications.</p> <p>We regret we are unable to comment, in detail, on individual Statements of Community Involvement but information on the planning service we offer, including advice on how to consult us, can be found at:</p> <p>https://www.gov.uk/protected-species-and-</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 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 and participating in the process of determining planning applications. 2. We are unable to comment in detail but information on the planning service we offer, including advice on how to consult us, can be found at: https://www.gov.uk/protected-species-and-sites-how-to-review-planning-proposals. 3. We now ask that all planning consultations are sent electronically to the central hub for our planning and development advisory service at the following address: consultations@naturalengland.org.uk 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noted. No change proposed. 2. Noted. No change proposed. 3. Our consultation database has been updated with the new contact details. No change to the SCI proposed.

Given Name	Family Name	Company/ Organisation	Number	ID	Your opinion - Please state your opinion?	Original Consultee Comment	SBC summary of consultee response	SBC draft response to consultee comment
						sites-how-to-review-planning-proposals. We now ask that all planning consultations are sent electronically to the central hub for our planning and development advisory service at the following address: consultations@naturalengland.org.uk This system enables us to deliver the most efficient and effective service to our customers.		
	Strategic Planning	Kent County Council	General Comments	SCI61		KCC would suggest that the term 'front loading' in paragraph 1.2 is too technical for general understanding and it is recommended that this is phrased slightly differently to avoid any misunderstanding.	1. Suggest the term 'front loading' in paragraph 1.2 is too technical for general understanding and it is recommended that this is phrased slightly differently.	1. Disagree; this is a widely used term in many aspects of everyday life. In fact, it was used in your own document on getting people involved in consultations. The term will be added to the glossary. Partial change proposed.
	KCC Minerals & Waste Planning Policy	Kent County Council Minerals and Waste Planning Policy Team	General Comments	SCI63		Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Swale Borough Council's draft Statement of Community Involvement. The County Council, as the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority has made comments to above consultation however the limited space available means they have been emailed to Gill Harris and the Planning Support Team on Monday the 4th December at 16.39 pm rather than be made here in consultation portal. See details from email below: (Part 1 of 2)	1. The Minerals and Waste Planning Authority recognises that the document is part of the local Development Plan and is aimed at how the local community can get involved in the preparation of local planning policy documents as well as decisions on planning applications. 2. The Minerals and Waste Planning Authority notes the inclusion of Kent County Council in Section 4 of the document ' <i>Who will we involve in consultations?</i> ' as a 'Statutory Consultee – Specific Bodies' with	1. Noted. No change proposed. 2. Noted. No change proposed.

Given Name	Family Name	Company/ Organisation	Number	ID	Your opinion - Please state your opinion?	Original Consultee Comment	SBC summary of consultee response	SBC draft response to consultee comment
						<p>Dear Gill,</p> <p>Please see comments below on behalf of the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority regarding Swale Borough Council's draft Statement of Community Involvement. The comments were too large to add as a comment so please accept our general comments below;</p> <p><u>Consultation on Swale borough Council's draft Statement of Community Involvement</u></p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Swale Borough Council's draft Statement of Community Involvement. The County Council, as the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority have the following comments to make on the above consultation:</p> <p>Having read and understood the draft Statement of Community Involvement, the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority recognises that the document is part of the local Development Plan and is aimed at how the local community can get involved in the preparation of local planning policy documents as well as decisions on planning applications.</p> <p>The Minerals and Waste Planning Authority notes the inclusion of Kent County Council in Section 4 of the document '<i>Who will we involve in consultations?</i>' as a 'Statutory Consultee – Specific Bodies' with regards to plan making, and understands that this will be used as a guide to identify those to involve and consult. The Minerals and Waste Planning Authority also recognises the inclusion of the County Council in its 'Duty to</p>	<p>regards to plan making. The Minerals and Waste Planning Authority also recognises the inclusion of the County Council in its 'Duty to Co-operate' as well as a 'Statutory Consultee' in the development management process.</p>	

Given Name	Family Name	Company/ Organisation	Number	ID	Your opinion - Please state your opinion?	Original Consultee Comment	SBC summary of consultee response	SBC draft response to consultee comment
						Co-operate' as well as a 'Statutory Consultee' in the development management process.		
M	Evans	Gladman Developments	General Comments	SCI64		<p>I write with reference to the above referenced consultation. Gladman welcome the opportunity to discuss the Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) for Swale. Gladman would wish to make the following brief comments on the document.</p> <p>Reference to the involvement of the development industry should also be made in Table 4, which considers how to involve the community in plan making. Such an approach would have a positive impact overall on the development of planning documents, making them more deliverable and allowing the Council to inform any examination of Development Plan Documents that they have taken a proactive and positive role in involving the development industry in plan making.</p> <p>I trust the above is helpful in moving the plan forward to the next stage, should you wish to discuss this representation further please do not hesitate to contact me. I would also be grateful if Gladman could be kept informed as plan making develops and should the Council wish to establish, or has already established, a developers forum to help inform plan making moving forward Gladman would wish to participate in any future meetings of the group.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Welcome the opportunity to discuss the SCI for Swale. 2. Reference to the involvement of the development industry should also be made in Table 4, which considers how to involve the community in plan making. Such an approach would have a positive impact overall on the development of planning documents, making them more deliverable and allowing the Council to inform any examination of Development Plan Documents that they have taken a proactive and positive role in involving the development industry in plan making. 3. Would also be grateful if Gladman could be kept informed as plan making develops and should the Council wish to establish, or has already established, a developers forum to help inform plan making moving forward Gladman would wish to participate in any future meetings of the group. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noted. 2. Table 4 states that specific, general and other consultees will be consulted and table 1 states that house builders and developers are designated under 'other consultation bodies'. No change proposed. 3. Swale already has an Agents/Developers Forum, run by our Development Management team, who have been passed your details. No change proposed.
	KCC Minerals & Waste Planning	Kent County Council Minerals and Waste	General Comments	SCI66		<p>(Part 2 of 2 continued from previous comment No. 63)</p> <p>With regards to the safeguarding of minerals and waste within Kent as set out in the</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. With regards to the safeguarding of minerals and waste within Kent as set out in the adopted Kent Minerals and Waste Local Plan 2013-30 KMWLP, it 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noted. No change proposed. 2. Noted. Paragraph 4.20 will be amended to refer

Given Name	Family Name	Company/ Organisation	Number	ID	Your opinion - Please state your opinion?	Original Consultee Comment	SBC summary of consultee response	SBC draft response to consultee comment
	Policy	Planning Policy Team				<p>adopted Kent Minerals and Waste Local Plan 2013-30 KMWLP (in particular policies CSM 5 Land-won Mineral Safeguarding, CSM 6 Safeguarded Wharves and Rail Depots, CSM 7 Safeguarding Other Mineral Plant Infrastructure, CSW 16 Safeguarding of Existing Waste Management Facilities, DM 7 Safeguarding Mineral Resources and DM 8 Safeguarding Minerals Management, Transportation, Production and Waste Management Facilities), it is important that the safeguarding of both minerals and waste matters are considered throughout the plan making and planning application processes to ensure that there is no unnecessary sterilisation of minerals or the compromise of continued lawful operation of waste and minerals facilities. The Minerals and Waste Planning Authority recognises the reference to mineral safeguarding in paragraph 4.20 of the draft Statement of Community Involvement, but is unable to see a similar reference to waste infrastructure safeguarding and would want to see a similar emphasise to the importance of waste infrastructure. As you are no doubt aware, both minerals and waste development play an important part in the delivery of sustainable development. Similarly, the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority feels it would be helpful to add that further information is available from the County Council regarding safeguarding and the related policies.</p> <p>In relation to Section 5 of the document '<i>Community Involvement in Plan Making</i>' the inclusion of the Kent Minerals and Waste</p>	<p>is important that the safeguarding of both minerals and waste matters are considered throughout the plan making and planning application processes to ensure that there is no unnecessary sterilisation of minerals or the compromise of continued lawful operation of waste and minerals facilities.</p> <p>2. Recognise the reference to mineral safeguarding in paragraph 4.20 of the draft Statement of Community Involvement, but is unable to see a similar reference to waste infrastructure safeguarding and would want to see a similar emphasise to the importance of waste infrastructure.</p> <p>3. The Minerals and Waste Planning Authority feels it would be helpful to add that further information is available from the County Council regarding safeguarding and the related policies.</p> <p>4. In relation to Section 5 of the document '<i>Community Involvement in Plan Making</i>' the inclusion of the Kent Minerals and Waste Local Plan and Kent County Council is noted and welcomed.</p> <p>5. Overall are pleased to see the inclusion of the County Council as the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority within the draft Statement of Community Involvement, but would strongly encourage the inclusion of waste</p>	<p>to waste infrastructure safeguarding as well as mineral safeguarding. Change proposed.</p> <p>3. An SCI sets out the parameters for consultation and is not a signposting document for further information for developers. However, paragraph 4.20 will be amended to refer to further information being available from the County Council. Change proposed.</p> <p>4. Noted. No change proposed.</p> <p>5. Noted. No change proposed.</p>

Given Name	Family Name	Company/ Organisation	Number	ID	Your opinion - Please state your opinion?	Original Consultee Comment	SBC summary of consultee response	SBC draft response to consultee comment
						<p>Local Plan and Kent County Council is noted and welcomed, as well as the contact details provided for the Minerals and Waste Planning Policy Team.</p> <p>Overall the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority is pleased to see the inclusion of the County Council as the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority within the draft Statement of Community Involvement, but would strongly encourage the inclusion of waste infrastructure safeguarding alongside mineral safeguarding to ensure that planning policy documents and planning applications are in accordance with the policies set out in the adopted Kent Minerals and Waste Local Plan 2013-30.</p> <p>If you have any queries, or would wish to discuss, please do not hesitate to contact a member of the Minerals and Waste Planning Policy Team on 03000 422370.</p>	<p>infrastructure safeguarding alongside mineral safeguarding.</p>	
Nigel	Heriz-Smith		General Comments	SCI67		<p>Dear SBC Planning Policy, copied to Lynsted with Kingsdown Parish Council for information</p> <p>Please find two documents attached. One is your PDF document with several detailed comments added to that document as "sticky notes".</p> <p>The second document is a Word document that forms my main response to the idea of the SCI.</p> <p>You will see I have some problems with the document and its context in relation to existing local initiatives over the years. I have also</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The representation by Mr Heriz-Smith has been split up and assigned to the most relevant questions. 2. Had problems with the document and its context in relation to existing local initiatives over the years. 3. At 41 pages long, this document is not friendly to "Community Involvement" when most people suffer from 'time poverty'. It reads like a "bureaucrat's charter". 4. It is a useful 'bringing-together' of what 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noted. No change proposed. 2. Noted. No change proposed. 3. Noted. Unfortunately in order to cover all of the necessary information the document needs to be this length. We worked hard to keep it as short and concise as possible, especially through the use of

Given Name	Family Name	Company/ Organisation	Number	ID	Your opinion - Please state your opinion?	Original Consultee Comment	SBC summary of consultee response	SBC draft response to consultee comment
						<p>made some suggestions regarding “accessibility” – it needs a much shorter plain language addition/Introduction or accompanying (e.g. four page) document if it is to truly engage with people with busy lives. 41 pages of quite detail technical material fails this test of accessibility.</p> <p>OVERVIEW</p> <p>At 41 pages long, this document is absolutely NOT friendly to "Community Involvement" when most people suffer from 'time poverty' under competing interests and commitments. It reads like a "bureaucrat's charter". It is a very useful 'bringing-together' of what is a complex area but that degree of technical content hits most people's "snooze button". Please can SBC consider a plain English introduction that states SBC's guiding principles and the purpose of planning? Even better would be a four-page statement in plain English that could be obtained electronically, placed in public spaces (libraries, shopping centres, further education centres, etc) or posted to homes of Residents with SBC's Magazine?</p> <p>I attach an annotated version of your PDF file, showing areas where I believe the document succeeds and fails or where it might be improved. While this <i>S.C.I exercise</i> has an ambition to improve local democratic engagement in Planning Policy and Decision-Making, it may never achieve more than a 'box ticking' status. That said, I believe this document is a useful device to help residents understand the complexity of the planning</p>	<p>is a complex area but that degree of technical content hits most people's "snooze button". What about a plain English introduction that states SBC's guiding principles and the purpose of planning or a four-page statement in plain English, electronically, available in public spaces or posted to homes with SBC's Magazine?</p> <p>5. Attach an annotated version of the SCI, showing areas where the document succeeds and fails or where it might be improved. (<i>These comments have been added under later reps form Mr Heriz-Smith.</i>)</p> <p>6. Whilst this S.C.I exercise has an ambition to improve local democratic engagement in Planning Policy and Decision-Making, it may never achieve more than a 'box ticking' status.</p> <p>7. Believe this document is a useful device to help residents understand the complexity of the planning process. Welcome the principles that underpin the 2011 Localism Act and this SCI. However, have serious reservations surrounding its value and how it plays to the public.</p> <p>8. Comments that follow are based on the experience of developing a democratic document – the Lynsted with Kingsdown Parish Design Statement. (continued at comment SCI68)</p>	<p>tabulated information. No change proposed.</p> <p>4. Noted. The introduction chapter gives a short overview of the SCI as a whole and the 'Guiding principles' chapter adds to this. It would be impossible to condense all of the information down to a 4 page document as what is relevant to one person in one set of circumstances is not the same for another person. No change proposed.</p> <p>5. Noted. These comments are dealt with under later reps form Mr Heriz-Smith. No change proposed.</p> <p>6. The SCI sets out a range of consultation methods and processes which aim to give all members of Swale the opportunity and knowledge to engage with the planning system. No change proposed.</p> <p>7. Noted. No change proposed.</p> <p>8. Noted. No change</p>

Given Name	Family Name	Company/ Organisation	Number	ID	Your opinion - Please state your opinion?	Original Consultee Comment	SBC summary of consultee response	SBC draft response to consultee comment
						<p>process – it does not overcome a fundamental problem of “time poverty” in most peoples’ lives that will result in skewed engagement by “communities”. My comments that follow are based on the experience of developing a democratic document – the Lynsted with Kingsdown Parish Design Statement that did qualify as Supplementary Planning Guidance for a period prior to being downgraded on policy changes by government. I welcome the principles that underpin the 2011 Localism Act and this SCI. However, I have serious reservations surrounding its value and how it plays to the public!</p> <p>(continued at comment 68)</p>		proposed.
Nigel	Heriz-Smith		General Comments	SCI68		<p>(continued from comment No. 67)</p> <p>Essentially:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Avoid Reinventing the Wheel. There already exist several documents created by Parish Councils as well as Residents. These various documents have largely been relegated and discarded by Swale Borough Council Planning Department on the basis of ‘cost’ (or effort). The option exists for SBC to ‘stump up’ to translate those documents to fit current Supplementary Planning Guidance terminology. • Past Community Instruments Relegated. If Community engagement in creating past documents can so easily be ignored, what is the incentive for communities to commit to what can 	<p>(continued from SCI67)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Avoid Reinventing the Wheel. There already exist several documents created by Parish Councils as well as Residents. The option exists for SBC to ‘stump up’ to translate those documents to fit current Supplementary Planning Guidance terminology. If Community engagement in creating past documents can so easily be ignored, what is the incentive for communities to commit to what can be a complex and long-winded process? 2. I was one of a group of Residents who spent more than two years pulling together a democratically-based Lynsted with Kingsdown Parish Design Statement. When central government changed the language of community 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. These comments do not relate to the SCI specifically and Swale’s Development Management still refer to the Lynsted Design Statement in planning decisions. No change proposed. 2. See above. No change proposed.

Given Name	Family Name	Company/ Organisation	Number	ID	Your opinion - Please state your opinion?	Original Consultee Comment	SBC summary of consultee response	SBC draft response to consultee comment
						<p>be a complex and long-winded process? Our Community engagement took place <u>outside</u> our Parish Council structure – they contributed but did not steer.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ I say this as one of a group of Residents who spent <u>more than two years</u> pulling together a democratically-based Lynsted with Kingsdown Parish Design Statement (<u>widely consulted on across the Parish, and with direct engagement with SBC's planning officials</u>). That document established a detailed and prioritised guide to key historic and material features of the built environment, existing land use and patterns of development to inform the formal decision-making processes. The Design Statement also contained <u>all</u> the relevant Policies that SBC has to work with – that technical guidance was included to help residents and developers alike. Our Community Document was, for a relatively short time, <u>formally adopted</u> by Swale Borough Council into its Planning Processes. When central government changed the language of community engagement, the option existed to convert the Design Statement 	<p>engagement, the option existed to convert the Design Statement into a usable format that met the new circumstances. SBC rejected that option because of cost. Our collective experience demonstrates how difficult and time-consuming it is to encourage meaningful Community engagement and how easily it can be buried by bureaucratic processes.</p> <p>(continued at SCI69)</p>	

Given Name	Family Name	Company/ Organisation	Number	ID	Your opinion - Please state your opinion?	Original Consultee Comment	SBC summary of consultee response	SBC draft response to consultee comment
						<p>into a usable format that met the new circumstances. SBC rejected that option because of <u>cost</u>. Our collective experience demonstrates how difficult and time-consuming it is to encourage meaningful Community engagement and how easily it can be buried by bureaucratic processes.</p> <p>(continued at comment No.69)</p>		
Nigel	Heriz-Smith		General Comments	SCI69		<p>(continued from comment No.68)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parish Council Initiatives. Other documents have been created under the guidance of Parish Councils. P.C.s have moral authority under our systems of “Representative Democracy”. This avenue relies on a balance of skilled and experienced individuals to ‘represent’ the spectrum of Community priorities. That balance will differ in each P.C. for better or worse. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Parish Plans can be useful places to open up local community engagement. ○ In circumstances of cross-boundary issues, perhaps there is a role for SBC Councillors (or others?) to ‘hold the ring’ in inter-Parish issues to makes sure a balance of interests is struck and fed into Parish and Borough 	<p>(continued from SCI68)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Other documents have been created under the guidance of Parish Councils who have moral authority under our systems of “Representative Democracy”. This avenue relies on a balance of skilled and experienced individuals to ‘represent’ the spectrum of Community priorities. Parish Plans can be useful places to open up local community engagement. 2. For cross-boundary issues, perhaps there is a role for SBC Councillors to ‘hold the ring’ in inter-Parish issues to makes sure a balance of interests is struck and fed into Parish and Borough decisions. <p>(continued at SCI70)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noted. The Council appreciate the efforts that local groups have, over the years, gone to to produce Parish and Neighbourhood Plans and often find that individuals involved then become community champions for future planning engagement. No change proposed. 2. Noted. As the SCI suggests, there is a role for SBC councillors to assist their constituents with planning consultations. No change proposed.

Given Name	Family Name	Company/ Organisation	Number	ID	Your opinion - Please state your opinion?	Original Consultee Comment	SBC summary of consultee response	SBC draft response to consultee comment
						<p>decisions? See para 4.9 of your PDF document.</p> <p>In the case of both Lynsted with Kingsdown and Teynham Parishes, the late Councillor John Disney spent a great deal of energy driving a “Greening Greenstreet” project. That Project brought together the interests of P.C.’s, residents and businesses on both sides of the A2. Sadly, with the passing of John Disney both PCs dropped the Project. As a resident in this “Greenstreet community”, it is sad to see P.C.’s ‘default’ to open hostility and competition in matters fall across the A2 dotted line!</p> <p>(continued at comment No. 70)</p>		
Nigel	Heriz-Smith		General Comments	SCI70		<p>(continued from comment No.69)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Role of SBC Officials and Councillors. With Planning Decisions and Priorities governed primarily by the agendas and ‘professional judgement’ of non-elected, remote Planning Officials - it is unlikely that this initiative will gain meaningful ‘traction’ in the established relationships and competition for resources. There are so many conflicting interests that “Community Involvement” will be lost in background noise (Paragraph 5 lists those “noises”). Officials and 	<p>(continued from SCI69)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Role of SBC Officials and Councillors: With Planning Decisions and Priorities governed by agendas and ‘professional judgement’ of non-elected Planning Officials - it is unlikely that this initiative will gain meaningful ‘traction’ in the established relationships and competition for resources. There are so many conflicting interests that “Community Involvement” will be lost in background noise (Paragraph 5 lists those “noises”). 	<p>1-4. It is agreed that there are a number of competing elements which the planning process need to take into account, including the results of community and stakeholder consultation. It is the role of the planning officers to assess these elements as part of their decision making process. No change proposed.</p>

Given Name	Family Name	Company/ Organisation	Number	ID	Your opinion - Please state your opinion?	Original Consultee Comment	SBC summary of consultee response	SBC draft response to consultee comment
						<p>Councillors are faced with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Developers - who seek high density developments in greenfield sites because of their profits. Locally, house prices have predictable ceilings, so developers will want to minimise input costs of land remediation, demolition, and landscaping that erode their profit margin. They also resist “affordable housing” because, by definition, they are less profitable. ○ Councillors and the Local Plan (largely prepared by and advised on by Officials but heavily skewed by Central Government objectives). Those targets/objectives bear little or no resemblance to the <u>capacity</u> of the construction industry and trades in our region. National Statistics confirm that this industry has contracted during the prolonged economic recession over recent years. ○ Local taxation – additional houses attract funding incentives from central government and longer-term streams of taxation. ○ All these elements conspire to create a form of “collective opportunism” on the part of <u>all</u> parties – that is to say, wanting 	<p>2. Officials and Councillors are faced with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Developers - who seek high density developments in greenfield sites because of their profits. They resist “affordable housing” because, by definition, they are less profitable. ○ Councillors and the Local Plan (largely prepared by and advised on by Officials but heavily skewed by Central Government objectives). Those targets/objectives bear little or no resemblance to the <u>capacity</u> of the construction industry and trades in our region. ○ Local taxation – additional houses attract funding incentives from central government and longer-term streams of taxation. <p>3. All these elements conspire to create a form of “collective opportunism” on the part of <u>all</u> parties –wanting to take the line of least resistance through the planning processes. To demonstrate “added value”, Officials and Councillors will justify approvals that offer “planning gain” by developers;</p> <p>4. The “aspiration” for Community Involvement is unachievable in any meaningful way when measured against these financial pressures.</p>	

Given Name	Family Name	Company/ Organisation	Number	ID	Your opinion - Please state your opinion?	Original Consultee Comment	SBC summary of consultee response	SBC draft response to consultee comment
						<p>to take the line of least resistance through the planning processes. To demonstrate “added value”, Officials and Councillors will justify approvals that offer “planning gain” by developers; even though experience over decades show that, once approval is given, the ‘planning gain’ sought by local government officials (and promised to communities) tend to evaporate under pressure from developers’ drive for profit. Realistically, once approval is granted, the ability of Councils to enforce compliance is sharply reduced.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The “aspiration” for Community Involvement is unachievable in any meaningful way when measured against these financial pressures. <p>(continued at comment No. 71)</p>	(continued at SCI71)	
Nigel	Heriz-Smith		General Comments	SCI71		<p>(continued from comment No. 70)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Importance of Borough Councillors in championing community actions: After considerable effort and engagement by the community, our design statement received no support by our then Borough Councillors who clearly had not understood the concept of design statements. Soul destroying for the team and community who had worked 	<p>(continued from SCI70)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Importance of Borough Councillors in championing community actions: Our design statement received no support by our then Borough Councillors. 2. “Communities”: Practical engagement by “Communities” will be skewed by the self-election of those able and willing to devote time and resources to the 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Agreed. The SCI has a section on the ‘Role of Elected members’ which highlights their important role in community consultation. No change proposed. 2. Agreed. It is accepted that people are busy which is why targeted

Given Name	Family Name	Company/ Organisation	Number	ID	Your opinion - Please state your opinion?	Original Consultee Comment	SBC summary of consultee response	SBC draft response to consultee comment
						<p>so hard on it. Thank goodness for the support and engagement of SBC officials and wider engagement of other Borough Councillors!</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Communities”: Practical engagement by “Communities” will be skewed by the self-election of those able and willing to devote time and resources to the planning process. Most people live busy lives and have many competing pressures for whatever “slack” they may have in their day. The result will often be that “Community Involvement” is based on non-representative political or social agendas of activist residents. To achieve validity within each Community, local residents have to be engaged by the “activists” with a neutral agenda. Having spent more than two years to achieve this ambition in the creation of the Lynsted with Kingsdown Parish Design Statement, I can testify to the huge effort needed and the impossibility of sustaining a group to defend and amend the ambitions of community engagement. This brings me back to the importance of SBC demonstrating its commitment to the existing documents by reinstating and updating existing documents to a level that fits the Planning Framework that surrounds your planning processes. <p>The ball is in SBC’s court. If the SCI results in support for <u>existing documents</u> created by Communities and Parish Councils, then it may have value and encourage <u>future</u></p>	<p>planning process. “Community Involvement” will be based on non-representative political or social agendas of activist residents. Local residents have to be engaged by the “activists” with a neutral agenda.</p> <p>3. If the SCI results in support for existing documents created by Communities and Parish Councils, then it may have value and encourage future engagement.</p> <p>(continued at SCI72)</p>	<p>and more concise consultations are often the most suitable. No change proposed.</p> <p>3. Noted. This comment does not relate to the SCI. No change proposed.</p>

Given Name	Family Name	Company/ Organisation	Number	ID	Your opinion - Please state your opinion?	Original Consultee Comment	SBC summary of consultee response	SBC draft response to consultee comment
						engagement. (continued at comment No. 72)		
Nigel	Heriz-Smith		General Comments	SCI72		<p>(continued from comment No. 71)</p> <p>General conclusions on the PDF Document include:-</p> <p>Chapter 1: Defines ‘aspirations and obligations’. However, as stated above, this approach would be strengthened by embedding work already undertaken local communities and Parish Councils – suitably updated by SBC to comply with changes in governing planning documents.</p> <p>The document nods in the direction of cross-boundary issues but fails adequately to address issues like “pollution”. Pollution intersects with Development and Planning decisions through the instruments of AQMAs. The National Policy Planning Framework establishes a specific and binding responsibility on Borough Planning Officials and the Council to address <u>cumulative</u> pollution issues when considering development approvals/rejections. The word “pollution” is only mentioned at the bottom of page 28.</p> <p>Additional clarity is needed on the intersection with Kent County Council responsibilities for road infrastructure and other matters. Communities need to understand the limitation of SBC’s competence.</p> <p>SBC mentions cross-boundary practices in Paragraph 2.16, sub-paragraph 1. History</p>	<p>General conclusions on the PDF Document include:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Chapter 1: Defines ‘aspirations and obligations’. However, this approach would be strengthened by embedding work already undertaken local communities and Parish Councils. The document nods in the direction of cross-boundary issues but fails adequately to address issues like “pollution”. The word “pollution” is only mentioned at the bottom of page 28. Additional clarity is needed on the intersection with Kent County Council responsibilities for road infrastructure and other matters. SBC mentions cross-boundary practices in Paragraph 2.16, sub-paragraph 1. History and current experience of major local planning applications faced by communities bring into question how this might work in the real world. Paragraph 3.2 sets out the circumstances when SBC can ignore expressions of “Community” priorities – the ‘whip hand’ remains with SBC officials based on “Resources and managing the process”. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Noted. This comment does not relate to the SCI. No change proposed. Noted. This comment is too specific for the SCI and would be addressed in the policies of the Local Plan. No change proposed. Kent County Council will be added to the glossary with an explanation of its different roles. Change proposed. Noted. This comment does not relate to the SCI. No change proposed. Disagree. Paragraph 3.2 does not “set out the circumstances when SBC can ignore expressions of “Community” priorities”; it sets out the constraints of time and resources that the Council has and suggests that a balance needs to be struck. No

Given Name	Family Name	Company/ Organisation	Number	ID	Your opinion - Please state your opinion?	Original Consultee Comment	SBC summary of consultee response	SBC draft response to consultee comment
						<p>and current experience of major local planning applications faced by communities bring into question how this might work in the real world. I have annotated the PDF at several places to suggest improvements in language.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.2 sets out the circumstances when SBC can ignore expressions of "Community" priorities –the 'whip hand' remains with SBC officials based on "Resources and managing the process". I recognise the competition for money and the time of officials - but setting out a five-year commitment (for example) with hard cash commitments would give communities some belief that their effort might have value.</p> <p>Paragraph 4 is an important statement of consultees. This may help residents better understand the process and players. I have some concerns over poorly defined terms that leave SBC able to continue to define what is "relevant" and "appropriate". This is a list without measurable commitment.</p> <p>Para 4.7 (Consultation Portal) is potentially valuable – however, to be engaging, it needs to be properly resourced and managed by SBC. Again, the usefulness of this feature rests on competition for resources.</p> <p>4th December 2017</p>	<p>6. Paragraph 4 is an important statement of consultees. This may help residents better understand the process and players. I have some concerns over poorly defined terms that leave SBC able to continue to define what is "relevant" and "appropriate".</p> <p>7. Para 4.7 (Consultation Portal) is potentially valuable – however, to be engaging, it needs to be properly resourced and managed by SBC.</p>	<p>change proposed.</p> <p>6. Noted. No change proposed.</p> <p>7. The Consultation Portal is properly managed and resourced by SBC. No specific examples of this not being the case are given. No change proposed.</p>
Nigel	Heriz-Smith		General Comments	SCI74		Title page; At 41 pages - this document is absolutely NOT friendly to "Community Involvement" where most people suffer from 'time poverty'. It reads like a "bureaucrats	<p>1. Title page; At 41 pages - this document is not friendly to "Community Involvement" where most people suffer from 'time poverty'. It reads like a</p>	<p>1. Noted. No change proposed.</p> <p>2. Noted. No change proposed.</p>

Given Name	Family Name	Company/ Organisation	Number	ID	Your opinion - Please state your opinion?	Original Consultee Comment	SBC summary of consultee response	SBC draft response to consultee comment
						<p>charter".</p> <p>About you: Nigel Heriz-Smith</p> <p>Previously one of the Chairmen of the Lynsted with Kingsdown Parish Design Statement group. Also the principal author tasked with reflecting all inputs from our communities and SBC Planning Department.</p> <p>Previous career - senior management in Central Government Departments.</p> <p>Para 2.3: Please reinstate Village and Parish Development Plans as Supplementary Panning Guidance. This would be a 'slam dunk' for your ambitions and credibility.</p> <p>Para 2.4; The 'natural' pathway for community involvement is the Parish Council. However, administrative limitations make these channels not fit for purpose. The case in point is the "Greenstreet Community" that is divided between Lynsted and Teynham with one result being lack of cohesion and a failure to truly reflect the interests of those most acutely affected by planning and development processes.</p> <p>Para 2.5: "Community Involvement" is not the same as "representations made by individuals" into the Planning/Development process. Simply printing the "ambition" and spelling out some 'pie in the sky' processes through which "communities" are able to engage is inadequate. The reality is that creating something worthy of the title "community" is hellishly difficult to establish and sustain. As time passes, SBC continues</p>	<p>"bureaucrat's charter".</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Previously one of the Chairmen of the Lynsted with Kingsdown Parish Design Statement group. 3. Para 2.3: Please reinstate Village and Parish Development Plans as Supplementary Panning Guidance. 4. Para 2.4; The 'natural' pathway for community involvement is the Parish Council. However, administrative limitations make these channels not fit for purpose. 5. Para 2.5: "Community Involvement" is not the same as "representations made by individuals" into the Planning/Development process. Simply printing the "ambition" and spelling out some 'pie in the sky' processes through which "communities" are able to engage is inadequate. 6. Perhaps SBC needs to include here [Paragraph 2.6] something that spells out how local representative groups can be created and supported in a way that falls outside the ambit of local parish councils? 7. Para 2.7: As stated in the Parish and Village Design Statements that exist at different levels of sophistication. 8. Para 2.8: Useful. 9. Para 2.16: Please add the governance of AQMA's and their status in local and 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Noted. This comment does not relate to the SCI. No change proposed. 4. It is agreed that Parish and Town Councils are a primary source of spreading information relevant to their area to residents. No change proposed. 5. The list of processes is wide ranging in order to ensure that a wide range of stakeholders are given the opportunity to engage. No change proposed. 6. This is not something that the SCI or planning department could facilitate. It is suggested that you contact your local councillor with this suggestion. No change proposed. 7. Noted. No change proposed. 8. Noted. No change proposed. 9. Noted. This is too detailed for the SCI. No

Given Name	Family Name	Company/ Organisation	Number	ID	Your opinion - Please state your opinion?	Original Consultee Comment	SBC summary of consultee response	SBC draft response to consultee comment
						<p>to exist; there is nothing like the necessary cohesion at local level to support a corresponding "instrument" through which engagement can be offered and sustained.</p> <p>Perhaps SBC needs to include here [Paragraph 2.6] something that spells out how local representative groups can be created and supported in a way that falls outside the ambit of local parish councils but is complementary to them? Is there scope for setting up collaborative sub-groups in this way under the auspices of Swale Borough Council?</p> <p>Para 2.7: As stated in the Parish and Village Design Statements that exist at different levels of sophistication.</p> <p>Para 2.8: Useful.</p> <p>Para 2.16: Please add the governance of AQMAs and their status in local and national policy.</p> <p>"Pollution" has only one superficial reference in this document - page 28, para 6.13.</p>	<p>national policy. "Pollution" has only one superficial reference in this document - page 28, para 6.13.</p>	<p>change proposed.</p>
Nigel	Heriz-Smith		General Comments	SCI75		<p>Para 2.16 (Point 2): Who benefits from this and how is it managed? I suspect the answer is "SBC" has this in its gift and does not want communities to bid for it?</p> <p>Is there any methodology to join up the dots between imposition of development and control over compensation for degradation of quality of life and health?</p> <p>Para 2.16 (Point 3): This is central to my</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Para 2.16 (Point 2): Who benefits from this and how is it managed? I suspect the answer is "SBC" has this in its gift and does not want communities to bid for it? 2. Is there any methodology to join up the dots between imposition of development and control over compensation for degradation of quality 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Swale does not currently have a CIL charging schedule but the government set out the mechanics for it, not the borough council. No change proposed. 2. This is not relevant to the SCI, but is a matter for the decision making

Given Name	Family Name	Company/ Organisation	Number	ID	Your opinion - Please state your opinion?	Original Consultee Comment	SBC summary of consultee response	SBC draft response to consultee comment
						<p>complaint about past initiatives that are side-lined by SBC. When the policies changed, SBC had the opportunity to restate its support for Village and Parish Design Statements - but SBC ducked that opportunity.</p> <p>SBC should show some leadership - otherwise this document and your ambitions are no better than 'box ticking'. The "Greening Greenstreet" Project withered on the vine with the death of Councillor John Disney. Its reinstatement and proper resourcing could provide a model and a sense of purpose to community involvement. SBC needs to spell out a firm intent (with budgets for use by communities) to sustain initiatives of this kind.</p> <p>Para 2.16 (Point 5): Having been involved over the past year in trying to restate a principle about "sensitive edges" to our community - contained in the Parish Design Statement - I am left doubting the intent or understanding of SBC Planners to properly address a coherent plan for our collective well-being. This cohesive approach is essential where health is at a premium due to demographics and the layout of buildings and roads. It is important that SBC public engagement plans show a commitment to the need for balance of infrastructure, homes, amenities, and services. SBC is not helped by its own problems of bureaucratic division of responsibilities between SBC and KCC. There are signs that this is recognised as an issue, but I remain to be convinced that recent declarations of intent are any more than box-ticking between KCC and SBC to avoid</p>	<p>of life and health?</p> <p>3. Para 2.16 (Point 3): This is central to my complaint about past initiatives that are side-lined by SBC, e.g. Village and Parish Design Statements.</p> <p>4. SBC should show some leadership - otherwise this document and your ambitions are no better than 'box ticking'. Its reinstatement and proper resourcing could provide a model and a sense of purpose to community involvement.</p> <p>5. Para 2.16 (Point 5): Having been involved over the past year in trying to restate a principle about "sensitive edges" to our community - contained in the Parish Design Statement - I am left doubting the intent or understanding of SBC Planners to properly address a coherent plan for our collective well-being. It is important that SBC public engagement plans show a commitment to the need for balance of infrastructure, homes, amenities, and services.</p> <p>6. Statement 1: "Workshops" are very prone to 'agenda setting' by the 'ringmasters' - in this case SBC. This document is a good example of a "virtual workshop." Workshops can sound as if they are 'empowering'.</p>	<p>process to resolve. No change proposed.</p> <p>3. As previously stated, Development Management still use the Lynsted design Statement in the decision making process. No change proposed.</p> <p>4. Noted. No change proposed.</p> <p>5. Noted. This does not relate to the SCI. No change proposed.</p> <p>6. Agreed. As Appendix 1 states, workshops need skilled facilitators to ensure a successful event. No change proposed.</p>

Given Name	Family Name	Company/ Organisation	Number	ID	Your opinion - Please state your opinion?	Original Consultee Comment	SBC summary of consultee response	SBC draft response to consultee comment
						<p>charges of maladministration.</p> <p>Statement 1: "Workshops" are very prone to 'agenda setting' by the 'ringmasters' - in this case SBC. This document is a good example of a "virtual workshop" but it entirely misses opportunities to embed the adverse impact of pollution and our "health and wellbeing" in the statement of community involvement. In short, workshops can sound as if they are 'empowering' but are often defined in terms that suit the 'ring-masters' (SBC) - who also control the written record that defines action or inaction.</p>		
Nigel	Heriz-Smith		General Comments	SCI76		<p>Statement 1: This form of "consultation" is open to abuse because the 'omission' of some questions will skew the results. It may show greater commitment by SBC if it opens the process of defining questions suited to a particular wider objective - in line with "customer focus" groups used by marketing companies. You may be surprised by the creativity that emerges and, of course, that 'focus group' becomes a useful additional channel for 'local champions'? Help do SBC's job! Inevitably there will be some hostility towards this approach by experts inside SBC or consultants employed by SBC - it takes a bit of faith but might be fruitful with SBC 'holding the ring'.</p> <p>Section titled: For all planning policy consultations Swale will:</p> <p>Bullet point 2: However, those who have time and motivation to engage may not be so 'representative'. Quite how you deal with this</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Statement 1: This form of "consultation" is open to abuse because the 'omission' of some questions will skew the results. It may show greater commitment by SBC if it opens the process of defining questions suited to a particular wider objective - in line with "customer focus" groups. Inevitably there will be some hostility towards this approach by experts inside SBC or consultants employed by SBC. Section titled: For all planning policy consultations Swale will: Bullet point 2: However, those who have time and motivation to engage may not be so 'representative'. How this plays into Parish Council responsibilities is also problematic. Section titled: For all planning policy consultations Swale will: Bullet point 4: "Proportionate" will be defined 'on the 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> This would be impractical as past experience has shown that the public like to have an initial steer to help them start thinking about the key issues. No change proposed. This is a common problem with all consultations; however the mixture of types of consultations should hopefully allow most people to contribute. No change proposed. Consultation could be endless but eventually a decision needs to be made so the word proportionate is appropriate in its use

Given Name	Family Name	Company/ Organisation	Number	ID	Your opinion - Please state your opinion?	Original Consultee Comment	SBC summary of consultee response	SBC draft response to consultee comment
						<p>is problematic - joint chairing of any local groups between that group and SBC? How this plays into Parish Council responsibilities is also problematic.</p> <p>Section titled: For all planning policy consultations Swale will:</p> <p>Bullet point 4: "Proportionate" will be defined 'on the hoof' by SBC and can mean that local community aspirations are devalued by the agenda of SBC. SBC will 'hold the ring' in exactly the same way that it does under current arrangements!</p> <p>Section titled: For all planning policy consultations Swale will:</p> <p>Bullet point 6: Very important. 'Crystal' marked for clarity.</p> <p>Section titled: For all planning policy consultations Swale will:</p> <p>Bullet point 11: "participated."</p> <p>Para 4.5: "when appropriate" are weasel words that reveal that SBC can ignore anything they like - whether Parish Councils or communities and individuals.</p> <p>Table 1: Typo: "area"</p> <p>Para 5.4: The complex interplay of complex documents brings into question the true ability of "communities" to engage in a meaningful way. Can SBC fund the creation of a "Community Portal" through which communities can share 'best practice' or</p>	<p>hoof' by SBC and can mean that local community aspirations are devalued by the agenda of SBC.</p> <p>4. Section titled: For all planning policy consultations Swale will: Bullet point 6: Very important. 'Crystal' marked for clarity.</p> <p>5. Section titled: For all planning policy consultations Swale will: Bullet point 11: "participated."</p> <p>6. Para 4.5: "when appropriate" are weasel words that reveal that SBC can ignore anything they like.</p> <p>7. Table 1: Typo: "area":</p> <p>8. Para 5.4: The complex interplay of complex documents brings into question the true ability of "communities" to engage in a meaningful way. Can SBC fund the creation of a "Community Portal" through which communities can share 'best practice' or effective engagement strategies?</p> <p>9. Para 5.9: SBC could usefully use this initiative to reinvigorate projects like the "Greening Greenstreet" Plan.</p> <p>10. Para 6.3: Typo; "and"</p> <p>11. Para 6.4: I applaud the role of Councillors - local and borough. Is it possible to show an undertaking to achieve this through public meetings?</p>	<p>here. No change proposed.</p> <p>4. The phrase 'when appropriate' means Swale will consult with consultees when it is appropriate to do so in conformity with the regulations, it does not mean that Swale can "ignore anything they like." No change proposed.</p> <p>5. Typo will be corrected. Change proposed.</p> <p>6. Noted. No change proposed.</p> <p>7. Typo will be corrected. Change proposed.</p> <p>8. This evidence base is required by central Government. This is something which could be raised with your Parish Council and local councillor. No change proposed.</p> <p>9. Noted. This comment does not relate to the SCI. No change proposed.</p> <p>10. Typo will be corrected.</p>

Given Name	Family Name	Company/ Organisation	Number	ID	Your opinion - Please state your opinion?	Original Consultee Comment	SBC summary of consultee response	SBC draft response to consultee comment
						<p>effective engagement strategies?</p> <p>Para 5.9: SBC could usefully use this initiative to reinvigorate projects like the "Greening Greenstreet" Plan that lapsed with the death of Councillor Disney who made significant progress in a "Neighbourhood" document.</p> <p>Para 6.3: Typo; "and"</p> <p>Para 6.4: I applaud the role of Councillors - local and borough. Is it possible to show and undertaking to achieve this through public meetings? That may help a higher level of engagement by "communities".</p>		<p>Change proposed.</p> <p>11. Councillors do attend public meetings. No change proposed.</p>
Nigel	Heriz-Smith		General Comments	SCI80		<p>Para 6.22: In the case of the opportunistic development proposal in Lynsted with Kingsdown Parish adjacent to the A2 - SBC officials went to extraordinary lengths to AVOID making a decision that might blight a future application on the same land by the same developers! This has struck this "Community" as dishonest and abuse of due process - some might say there was collusion.</p> <p>Such practices undermine willingness of residents to become engaged in the Planning Process which is seen as perverse.</p> <p>General Comments: I have attached a narrative in a Word document attached to this response.</p>	<p>1. Para 6.22: In the case of the opportunistic development proposal in Lynsted with Kingsdown Parish adjacent to the A2 - SBC officials went to extraordinary lengths to AVOID making a decision that might blight a future application on the same land by the same developers! This has struck this "Community" as dishonest and abuse of due process. Such practices undermine willingness of residents to become engaged.</p>	<p>1. Noted. These comments do not relate to the SCI. No change proposed.</p>
Jennifer	Wilson	Environment Agency	General Comments	SCI81		<p>Thank you for consulting on your Statement of Community Involvement.</p> <p>We have no comments to make.</p>	<p>1. No comments.</p>	<p>1. Noted. No change proposed.</p>

Given Name	Family Name	Company/ Organisation	Number	ID	Your opinion - Please state your opinion?	Original Consultee Comment	SBC summary of consultee response	SBC draft response to consultee comment
Janice	Bengall		Question 1	SCI5	Disagree		1. Disagree. No reason given.	1. Noted, but with no comment given, a response cannot be made. No change proposed.
Stephen	Parfitt		Question 1	SCI7	Agree		1. Agree. No reason given.	1. Noted. No change proposed.
Debbie	stock	Swale Clinical Commissions Group	Question 1	SCI14	Agree		1. Agree. No reason given.	1. Noted. No change proposed.
Debbie	stock	Swale Clinical Commissions Group	Question 1	SCI15	Agree		1. Agree. No reason given.	1. Noted. No change proposed.
Trevor	Hall	Kent Police	Question 1	SCI21	Agree	Satisfied the proposal meets necessary requirements	1. Agree. No reason given.	1. Noted. No change proposed.
David	Crompton		Question 1	SCI31	Agree		1. Agree. No reason given.	1. Noted. No change proposed.
Stephen	Lillicrap		Question 1	SCI34	Agree		1. Agree. No reason given.	1. Noted. No change proposed.
	Strategic Planning	Kent County Council	Question 1	SCI62	No Opinion	KCC would suggest that this should be revised to 'Our General Principles for Involvement', as the term "involvement" is referenced in the subsequent sentence.	1. No opinion. However, suggest that this should be revised to 'Our General Principles for Involvement', as the term "involvement" is referenced in the subsequent sentence.	1. Noted. Statement 1 states that there are three elements to consultation: participation, consultation and information. Consultation is used as it is a more recognised phrase. No change

Given Name	Family Name	Company/ Organisation	Number	ID	Your opinion - Please state your opinion?	Original Consultee Comment	SBC summary of consultee response	SBC draft response to consultee comment
								proposed.
Nigel	Heriz-Smith		Question 1	SCI77	No Opinion	<p>Question 1: While this list is useful as a description of "processes", it misses an opportunity to engage community 'focus groups' in setting the questions that become the foundation for fuller consultation. As it stands, this process is too "Top Down". With a bit of humility, you might find this early process entertaining! (and useful) Another thought, that might be hard to manage! How about an "Open Season Invitation" to residents and businesses to put in order of importance the issues most important to them? Granted you would be doing VERY well to get up to 10% response rate, that process my give you a database of 'likely candidates' to champion the search for others in our various communities who might be engaged in particular consultations.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No opinion. This list is useful as a description of "processes", but misses an opportunity to engage community 'focus groups' in setting the questions that become the foundation for fuller consultation. This process is too "Top Down". You might find this early process entertaining and useful but hard to manage. 2. How about an "Open Season Invitation" to residents and businesses to put in order of importance the issues most important to them? The process my give you a database of 'likely candidates' to champion the search for others in our communities who might be engaged in particular consultations. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noted. Statement 1 sets out Swale's General Principles to Consultation so is by it's nature quite process focused. However, later in the document when the different types of consultation methods are described, especially in Appendix 1, focus groups do feature, especially for topic based discussions. It is agreed that these groups can be hard to manage so need careful planning and a lot of resources but the results can often be worth it. No change proposed. 2. The suggestion is too specific to be in the SCI but is something which we would consider at the early stages of plan making. It was used at the beginning of work on the 2017 Local Plan and proved popular with residents and useful for the planners. No change proposed.

Given Name	Family Name	Company/ Organisation	Number	ID	Your opinion - Please state your opinion?	Original Consultee Comment	SBC summary of consultee response	SBC draft response to consultee comment
Janice	Bengall		Question 2	SCI1	Disagree		1. Disagree. No reason given.	1. Noted, as no comment is given, no response can be made. No change proposed.
Janice	Bengall		Question 2	SCI2	Disagree	Members of the public especially daily commuters should be consulted in view of the diabolical congestion on all roads around Sheppey and Sittingbourne. No further housing should be considered until the congestion at the Stockbury roundabout is addressed. This can only be rectified by a sensible proposal. Not traffic lights. An underpass or flyover is required.	1. Disagree. Commuters need to be consulted about the congestion on Sheppey and at Sittingbourne. No further housing until congestion at Stockbury is addressed.	1. Noted. These comments do not relate to the SCI itself, but to matters that a review of the Local Plan will need to take into account. No change proposed.
Stephen	Parfitt		Question 2	SCI8	Agree		1. Agree. No reason given.	1. Noted. No change proposed.
Debbie	stock	Swale Clinical Commissions Group	Question 2	SCI16	Disagree	Primary Care Trust is now Clinical Commissioning Groups.	1. Disagree. Primary Care Trust is now Clinical Commissioning Groups.	1. Noted. The document will be updated to ensure the correct name is used. Change proposed.
Debbie	stock	Swale Clinical Commissions Group	Question 2	SCI17	Disagree	Unable to put this comment in section below - NHS Clinical Commissioning Groups should be statutory consultees.	1. Disagree. NHS Clinical Commissioning Groups should be statutory consultees.	1. Noted. The Primary Care Trusts (which will be changed to NHS Clinical Commissioning Groups) are in Table 1 as statutory consultees for plan making but are not in Table 2 for planning application consultations so they will be added to Table 2 as a statutory consultee. Change proposed.

Given Name	Family Name	Company/ Organisation	Number	ID	Your opinion - Please state your opinion?	Original Consultee Comment	SBC summary of consultee response	SBC draft response to consultee comment
Trevor	Hall	Kent Police	Question 2	SCI22	Agree		1. Agree. No reason given.	1. Noted. No change proposed.
David	Crompton		Question 2	SCI32	Agree		1. Agree. No reason given.	1. Noted. No change proposed.
Stephen	Lillicrap		Question 2	SCI35	Agree		1. Agree. No reason given.	1. Noted. No change proposed.
S	Palmer		Question 2	SCI42	Disagree	CPRE, Ramblers Association and Rural England where applications include countryside.	1. Disagree. CPRE, Ramblers Association and Rural England should be consulted where applications include countryside.	1. Noted. This question actually relates to plan making not planning applications. Table 2 shows who will be consulted on planning applications and none of the suggested groups are included. However, CPRE receive the weekly list of planning applications and the Ramblers Association and Rural England are encouraged to also sign up to receive the weekly list and track planning applications on the public access system. No change proposed.
Lynda	Fisher	Iwade Parish Council	Question 2	SCI49	No Opinion	The above consultation was discussed at the November meeting of Iwade Parish Council and my Members have asked me to write stating that we agree that all Parish Councils should be fully engaged in this process	1. No opinion. Agree that all Parish Councils should be fully engaged in this process.	1. Noted. No change proposed.

Given Name	Family Name	Company/ Organisation	Number	ID	Your opinion - Please state your opinion?	Original Consultee Comment	SBC summary of consultee response	SBC draft response to consultee comment
Alan	Byrne	Historic England	Question 2	SCI56	No Opinion	<p><u>National Amenity Societies</u></p> <p><u>Ancient Monuments Society</u>, St Ann's Vestry Hall, 2 Church Entry, London, EC4V 5HB</p> <p><u>Council for British Archaeology</u>, Beatrice de Cardi House, 66 Boothman, York, YO30 7BZ</p> <p><u>The Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings</u>, 37 Spital Square, London, E1 6DY</p> <p><u>The Georgian Group</u>, 6 Fitzroy Square, London, W1T 5DX</p> <p><u>The Victorian Society</u>, 1 Priory Gardens, Bedford Park, London, W4 1TT</p> <p><u>The Twentieth Century Society</u>, 70 Cowcross Street, London, EC1M 6EJ</p> <p><u>The Gardens Trust</u>, 70 Cowcross Street, London EC1M 6EJ</p> <p>The Gardens Trust was formed in July 2015 following a merger of The Garden History Society and the Association of Gardens Trusts, representing the County Gardens Trusts of England and Wales. The Garden History Society had been granted statutory consultee status in the planning system in 1995, and The Gardens Trust has been confirmed in this role by Government. Local planning authorities must therefore consult the Gardens Trust on planning applications that may affect historic designed landscapes in England that are on the Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest that is held by Historic England.</p> <p><u>The Theatres Trust</u>, 22 Charing Cross Road,</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No opinion. However, the following groups are national amenity societies which should be consulted: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Ancient Monuments Society, Council for British Archaeology, The Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings, The Georgian Group, The Victorian Society and The Twentieth Century Society. 2. The Gardens Trust was formed following a merger of The Garden History Society and the Association of Gardens Trusts, representing the County Gardens Trusts of England and Wales. The Garden History Society had been granted statutory consultee status in the planning system in 1995, and The Gardens Trust has been confirmed in this role by Government. Must consult the Gardens Trust on planning applications that may affect historic designed landscapes in England that are on the Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest. 3. The Theatres Trust, is a statutory consultee on planning applications that affect land on which there is a theatre. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noted. These groups are covered by the following entry in table 1 'civic societies, cultural, historical and archaeological groups or bodies.' These details will be sent to colleagues in Development Management to ensure the suggested societies are consulted where appropriate. No change proposed. 2. Noted. These details will be sent to colleagues in Development Management to ensure the Gardens Trust are consulted where appropriate. No change proposed. 3. Noted. No change proposed.

Given Name	Family Name	Company/ Organisation	Number	ID	Your opinion - Please state your opinion?	Original Consultee Comment	SBC summary of consultee response	SBC draft response to consultee comment
						<p>London, WC2H 0QL</p> <p>The Theatres Trust is a statutory consultee on planning applications that affect land on which there is a theatre.</p>		
	Strategic Planning	Kent County Council	Question 2	SCI59	No Opinion	<p>KCC - as the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) - is a statutory consultee within the planning process for surface water drainage but is not listed in the table of statutory consultees on pages 10-11 and 14-15. The County Council would request that it is listed specifically as the Lead Local Flood Authority these tables to ensure that its role as a statutory consultee is not omitted from any relevant consultations.</p> <p>Similarly, KCC as the Highways Authority should be listed as a separate statutory consultee within the table on pages 10-11.</p> <p>KCC Public Rights of Way and Access Services (PRoW) falls under the Highways Authority and should be consulted on both residential (10+ dwellings or a site of more than 0.5ha) and non-residential development (with floor space of 1,000 sq m). This is applicable whether or not there are any PRoWs within the site that would be directly affected by the proposal, in order for KCC to consider the wider impacts on and potential opportunities of the proposal for the surrounding PRoW network.</p>	<p>1. No opinion. However, KCC - as the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) - is a statutory consultee within the planning process for surface water drainage but is not listed in the table of statutory consultees on pages 10-11 and 14-15. It should be listed specifically as the Lead Local Flood Authority to ensure that its role as a statutory consultee is not omitted from any relevant consultations.</p> <p>2. KCC as the Highways Authority should be listed as a separate statutory consultee within the table on pages 10-11. KCC Public Rights of Way and Access Services (PRoW) falls under the Highways Authority and should be consulted on both residential (10+ dwellings or a site of more than 0.5ha) and non-residential development (with floor space of 1,000 sq m). This is applicable whether or not there are any PRoWs within the site that would be directly affected by the proposal, in order for KCC to consider the wider impacts on and potential opportunities of the proposal for the surrounding PRoW network.</p>	<p>1. Noted. Table 1 Lists Kent County Council as a Statutory Specific consultee and this entry was designed to cover all of the County's roles, including heritage, highways, Lead Local Flood Authority, etc. Table 2 also lists County Planning Authorities as statutory consultees. However, for clarity, KCC (Lead Local Flood Authority) will be added to tables 1 and 2. Change proposed.</p> <p>2. Table 2 lists Kent County Council as a Statutory Specific consultee and this entry was designed to cover all of the County's roles, including heritage, highways, etc. However, for clarity, KCC (Highways) will be added to table 1. Change proposed.</p>
M	Evans	Gladman	Question 2	SCI65	No Opinion	Whilst Gladman recognise that the SCI is	1. No opinion. However, recognise that	1. The Council disagrees as

Given Name	Family Name	Company/ Organisation	Number	ID	Your opinion - Please state your opinion?	Original Consultee Comment	SBC summary of consultee response	SBC draft response to consultee comment
		Developments				<p>focused on ensuring that residents within the Borough are rightly as involved in the plan making process as possible we are concerned that the SCI as currently written gives no consideration as the role to which developers can play in plan making. Gladman would therefore consider, in response to Question, 2 that consideration ought to be given to including a developer's forum or some other means by which the development industry can have constructive involvement in plan making. Whatever form this engagement with the industry takes should be referenced in Table 1 of the SCI. Developers and landowners are key representatives in ensuring Local Plans in particular are deliverable, and many of the landowners involved in the process are also members of the community. It is vital that they are actively involved in the planning process.</p>	<p>the SCI is focused on ensuring that residents are rightly as involved in the plan making process as possible but are concerned that the SCI as currently gives no consideration as the role to which developers can play in plan making. Consideration ought to be given to including a developer's forum or some other means by which the development industry can have constructive involvement in plan making.</p> <p>2. Whatever form this engagement with the industry takes should be referenced in Table 1 of the SCI. Developers and landowners are key representatives in ensuring Local Plans in particular are deliverable. It is vital that they are actively involved in the planning process.</p>	<p>in paragraph 4.2 developers/agents are listed as one of the main groups to be targeted for consultation. Table 1 lists 'house builders and developers – both through the Forum and individually' as 'other consultation bodies and organisations'. Also, at various points throughout the document this group is referred to as being consulted through both the development management and plan making processes. No change proposed.</p> <p>2. An agents/developers forum already exists in Swale and is referenced in table 2. Your details have been passed to the organisers of the Forum. No change proposed.</p>
Nigel	Heriz-Smith		Question 2	SCI178	No Opinion	<p>Question 2: Have you considered adding faith groups? They can be useful for their engagement with youth groups, vulnerable adults, a wider range of cultures? Otherwise this looks like a "WASP" exercise. Faith Groups also take a view on "Community" that may cross administrative boundaries sustained by local and national government.</p>	<p>1. No opinion. However, have you considered adding faith groups; they can be useful for their engagement with youth groups, vulnerable adults, a wider range of cultures? Faith Groups take a view on "Community" that may cross administrative boundaries sustained by local and national</p>	<p>1. Table 1 'consultees for plan making' already lists bodies which represent the interests of different religious groups in the area as statutory consultee – general bodies. No change</p>

Given Name	Family Name	Company/ Organisation	Number	ID	Your opinion - Please state your opinion?	Original Consultee Comment	SBC summary of consultee response	SBC draft response to consultee comment
							government.	proposed.
Stephen	Parfitt		Question 3	SCI9	Agree		1. Agree. No reason given.	1. Noted. No change proposed.
Trevor	Hall	Kent Police	Question 3	SCI23	Agree		1. Agree. No reason given.	1. Noted. No change proposed.
Trevor	Hall	Kent Police	Question 3	SCI24	Agree		1. Agree. No reason given.	1. Noted. No change proposed.
Stephen	Lillicrap		Question 3	SCI36	Agree		1. Agree. No reason given.	1. Noted. No change proposed.
Nigel	Heriz-Smith		Question 3	SCI79	No Opinion	Question 3: See Q2. I agree that ethnic/cultural engagement must be addressed as our communities become increasingly diverse and complex (and mobile). For example, French people appear far less attached than British people to having large gardens (or any gardens). They may have a richer way of looking at the places we/they live? The opportunities to challenge our/your assumptions should be welcomed.	1. No opinion. However, agree that ethnic/cultural engagement must be addressed as our communities become increasingly diverse and complex (and mobile). They may have a richer way of looking at the places we/they live? The opportunities to challenge our/your assumptions should be welcomed.	1. Noted. No change proposed.
Stephen	Parfitt		Question 4	SCI10	Agree		1. Agree. No reason given.	1. Noted. No change proposed.
Stephen	Lillicrap		Question 4	SCI37	No Opinion		1. No opinion. No reason given.	1. Noted. No change proposed.
Stephen	Parfitt		Question 5	SCI11	Agree		1. Agree. No reason given.	1. Noted. No change proposed.
Trevor	Hall	Kent Police	Question 5	SCI25	Agree		1. Agree. No reason given.	1. Noted. No change

Given Name	Family Name	Company/ Organisation	Number	ID	Your opinion - Please state your opinion?	Original Consultee Comment	SBC summary of consultee response	SBC draft response to consultee comment
								proposed.
Stephen	Lillicrap		Question 5	SCI38	Agree		1. Agree. No reason given.	1. Noted. No change proposed.
S	Palmer		Question 5	SCI43	Disagree	<p>All people who live within a set distance or neighbouring roads should be written to with clear indication on the outside of the envelope that it concerns planning, if the application is for new housing or a major development. The additional costs should be paid for by the applicant.</p> <p>Consideration to notify Parish Councils, church leaders and use schools to pass on leaflets. Inside Swale is not always delivered in a timely manner. The use of the iNet as well.</p> <p>As the use of paper copies of newspapers have declined then greater use of online local news is required with a clear notice as I have never seen any notification other than a news item.</p> <p>In fact I found out about the Local Plan through word of mouth.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Disagree. 2. For new housing or a major development, people who live within a set distance should be written to with clear indication on the envelope that it concerns planning. The additional costs should be paid for by the applicant. 3. Consideration to notify Parish Councils, church leaders and use schools to pass on leaflets. Inside Swale is not always delivered in a timely manner. 4. The iNet should be used. 5. As readership of newspapers has declined, greater use should be made of online local news with a clear notice. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noted. 2. For new housing or a major development planning applications Table 7 sets out that neighbour notification letters will be sent, site notices put up, adverts in the local press and use of Swale's website and this is felt adequate. For Plan making consultations, the SCI is flexible to allow this for specific cases but is not practicable for all LP allocations. It is felt that stamping 'Planning' on the envelope may actually put people off from reading the letter. No change proposed. 3. For Plan making consultations, all Parish and Town Councils in Swale and in adjoining boroughs are notified and for Planning Applications, the Parish/Town Council are

Given Name	Family Name	Company/ Organisation	Number	ID	Your opinion - Please state your opinion?	Original Consultee Comment	SBC summary of consultee response	SBC draft response to consultee comment
								<p>consulted. Many of Swale's churches and schools are on Swale's consultation database and are therefore consulted. Inside Swale is only used when the dates of delivery are suitable. No change proposed.</p> <p>4. Assuming the internet is being referred to, it is used widely for both planning applications and plan making, notably via our consultation portal and the Public Access system for planning applications. No change proposed.</p> <p>5. It is agreed that readership of printed copies of newspapers is declining, however, it is still a statutory duty to advertise certain planning notices in the printed versions. Online local news often covers planning issues if they have been notified through press releases. No change proposed.</p>
Stephen	Parfitt		Question 6	SCI12	Agree		1. Agree. No reason given.	1. Noted. No change

Given Name	Family Name	Company/ Organisation	Number	ID	Your opinion - Please state your opinion?	Original Consultee Comment	SBC summary of consultee response	SBC draft response to consultee comment
								proposed.
Trevor	Hall	Kent Police	Question 6	SCI26	Agree		1. Agree. No reason given.	1. Noted. No change proposed.
	Strategic Planning	Kent County Council	Question 6	SCI60	No Opinion	<p>KCC would classify consultation methods as those in which the activities people participate in to have their say and/or provide feedback. Some of the activities listed are 'promotional methods' rather than consultation methods (such as press releases and formal advertisements), so it is recommended that the heading may need to be re-phrased to ensure the contents of the table are clear.</p> <p>Furthermore, in the Table of Consultation Methods in Appendix 1, KCC suggests that the term 'available for sale' should be moved to the end of the sentence in order to promote the free methods of access first. The questionnaire/survey method is stated as being time consuming and costly, but this depends on the exact method of the questionnaire/survey. It is considered that an online questionnaire is unlikely to be time consuming and costly in comparison to a face-to-face survey with a stratified sample. KCC would therefore suggest that the considerations for questionnaire/surveys could be revised to consider the potential and difference between online and face-to-face surveys. It is likely that an online questionnaire/survey may enable Swale Borough Council to reach some of the 'hard to reach' groups.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No opinion. However, KCC classify consultation methods as those in which people participate to have their say and/or provide feedback. Some of the activities listed are 'promotional methods', so the heading may need to be re-phrased to ensure the contents of the table are clear. 2. In the Table of Consultation Methods the term 'available for sale' should be moved to the end of the sentence in order to promote the free methods of access first. 3. The questionnaire/survey method is stated as being time consuming and costly, but this depends on the exact method. An online questionnaire is unlikely to be time consuming and costly in comparison to a face-to-face survey. Suggest that the considerations for questionnaire/surveys could be revised to consider the potential and difference between online and face-to-face surveys. Online questionnaires/surveys may help to reach some of the 'hard to reach' groups. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noted. Statement 1 states that there are three elements to consultation: participation, consultation and information. The activities which could be considered as 'promotional methods' would come under information and are an important part of consultation at it alerts and informs the public to future and/or current consultations and how to access those events. No change proposed. 2. This is deemed unnecessary as the five consultation methods listed previously in the table are all free methods of accessing consultations. No change proposed. 3. Whilst it is agreed that on-line questionnaires can reduce cost and time, it must be

Given Name	Family Name	Company/ Organisation	Number	ID	Your opinion - Please state your opinion?	Original Consultee Comment	SBC summary of consultee response	SBC draft response to consultee comment
								remembered that a large proportion of respondents to Swale's consultations continue to either email or hand write responses. Until the majority of respondents submit comments using the online portal, online questionnaires will have a limited response rate and therefore face-to-face surveys would be required. The text will be altered to say "Likely to be time consuming and costly, until online questionnaires can be used once online usage for responding to consultations increases." Change proposed.
Janice	Bengall		Question 7	SCI3	Disagree	When objections are raised by members of the public especially with regard to infrastructure the objections are not listened to or acted upon. For example Highways England have no idea at all with regard to the dreadful situation commuters are faced with every day in the a245. To get to work in Maidstone for 9.00am for example you would have to leave the Isle of Sheppey at 5.30am. Although this has been mentioned on numerous occasions Highways England continue to state that there is no problem.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Disagree. 2. Objections raised by the public with regard to infrastructure are not listened to or acted upon. Highways England has no idea of the dreadful situation commuters are faced with A249. Although this has been mentioned on numerous occasions Highways England continue to state that there is no problem. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noted. 2. All objections are considered by the Council and help form it's Local Plan. The SCI makes it clear that this process will occur. A duty to consult is not necessarily a duty to agree with all stakeholders. No change proposed.

Given Name	Family Name	Company/ Organisation	Number	ID	Your opinion - Please state your opinion?	Original Consultee Comment	SBC summary of consultee response	SBC draft response to consultee comment
Janice	Bengall		Question 7	SCI14	Disagree	The local authority have not obtained up to date information on the infrastructure in the Sheppey and Sittingbourne areas. The general public have tried to inform them of the lack of infrastructure but the local authority have taken no notice.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Disagree. The local authority has not obtained up to date information on the infrastructure in Sheppey and Sittingbourne. The public tried to inform them of the lack of infrastructure but no notice is taken. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Noted. The issue is noted, but this does not relate to the SCI itself. No change proposed.
Trevor	Hall	Kent Police	Question 7	SCI27	Agree		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Agree. No reason given. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Noted. No change proposed.
Stephen	Lillicrap		Question 7	SCI39	Agree		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Agree. No reason given. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Noted. No change proposed.
Alan	Byrne	Historic England	Question 7	SCI55	No Opinion	<p>Neighbourhood Plans – Under the Regulations covering neighbourhood planning, before submitting the proposed Neighbourhood Plan to the local planning authority, the group needs to consider if various organisations (statutory consultees) need to be consulted about the proposals, because they affect the natural or historic environment. These statutory consultees include Historic England, Natural England and the Environment Agency amongst others whose interests may be affected. The statutory consultees have jointly produced guidance on the natural and historic environment in neighbourhood planning:</p> <p>http://content.historicengland.org.uk/content/docs/planning/planning-environmentneighbourhood-advice.pdf</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> No opinion. However, under the Regulations covering neighbourhood planning, before submitting the proposed Neighbourhood Plan to the local planning authority, the group needs to consider if various organisations (statutory consultees) need to be consulted about the proposals, because they affect the natural or historic environment. The statutory consultees have jointly produced guidance on the natural and historic environment in neighbourhood planning: http://content.historicengland.org.uk/content/docs/planning/planning-environmentneighbourhood-advice.pdf 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Table 5 sets out where the LA will advise neighbourhood groups on process and regulations and this covers ensuring that relevant consultees have been consulted. No change proposed.
Debbie	stock	Swale Clinical	Question 8	SCI18	Agree		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Agree. No reason given. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Noted. No change

Given Name	Family Name	Company/ Organisation	Number	ID	Your opinion - Please state your opinion?	Original Consultee Comment	SBC summary of consultee response	SBC draft response to consultee comment
		Commissions Group						proposed.
Trevor	Hall	Kent Police	Question 8	SCI28	Agree		1. Agree. No reason given.	1. Noted. No change proposed.
Stephen	Lillicrap		Question 8	SCI40	Agree		1. Agree. No reason given.	1. Noted. No change proposed.
S	Palmer		Question 8	SCI44	Disagree	<p>The documents can be difficult to read and understand as they are not in plain English and not written for a lay person.</p> <p>The council should hold public meetings to present the application and receive feedback if an application is for more than a certain number i.e. 25 or more.</p>	<p>1. Disagree.</p> <p>2. The documents can be difficult to read and understand and are not in plain English.</p> <p>3. The council should hold public meetings to present the application and receive feedback if an application is for more than a certain number i.e. 25 or more.</p>	<p>1. Noted.</p> <p>2. Unfortunately planning terminology is very technical by nature and whilst every effort is made to make documents relating to planning applications understandable it is often difficult. However, there is always an officer's name and contact details and they are happy to explain the documents to people either by phone. No change proposed.</p> <p>3. The Council encourages applicants to undertake public consultation, including meetings, however, it would be too resource intensive for the Council to undertake public meetings for all applications of 25 of more dwellings.</p>

Given Name	Family Name	Company/ Organisation	Number	ID	Your opinion - Please state your opinion?	Original Consultee Comment	SBC summary of consultee response	SBC draft response to consultee comment
								Often Parish or Town Council will hold a public meeting and a planning officer can attend to assist discussion. No change proposed.
S	Palmer		Question 8	SCI45	Disagree	<p>Not all documents are online for example the list of constraints.</p> <p>Documents are difficult to read and understand as they are not written in plain and clear English or for a lay person.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Disagree. 2. Not all documents are online for example the list of constraints. 3. Documents are difficult to read and understand as they are not written in plain and clear English. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noted. 2. The list of constraints is currently on the public access system. The Council is currently working on an online mapping system which will link to the public access system and will show the constraints on a map base. This should be live by late Spring. No change proposed. 3. Planning documents are inherently technical and the Council cannot control what planning applicants include within the information they submit. Planning officers contact details are always on the application details and are happy to help the public understand any aspect of a planning application which they are unsure about. No change

Given Name	Family Name	Company/ Organisation	Number	ID	Your opinion - Please state your opinion?	Original Consultee Comment	SBC summary of consultee response	SBC draft response to consultee comment
								proposed.
Alan	Byrne	Historic England	Question 8	SCI53	Disagree	<p>In view of our remit, some general principles are outlined below which we suggest are reflected in the SCI. Planning and Development in the Historic Environment – A Charter for Historic England Advisory Services (sixth edition, April 2014): This document, available on our website:</p> <p>http://www.historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/charter-headvisory-services/</p> <p>sets out Historic England’s advisory services for planning and development. It details the circumstances where we must be consulted upon planning applications affecting the historic environment, and the type of information required for consultations with Historic England on proposals affecting nationally important heritage assets. It also underlines the value and importance of pre-application discussions with us on proposals with the potential for major change, or damage, to nationally important heritage assets. The principles set out in this charter should inform the Council’s consultation approach to significant planning applications.</p>	<p>1. Disagree. Some general principles are outlined below which we suggest are reflected in the SCI. Planning and Development in the Historic Environment – A Charter for Historic England Advisory Services (sixth edition, April 2014) sets out Historic England’s advisory services for planning and development. It details the circumstances where we must be consulted upon planning applications affecting the historic environment, and the type of information required for consultations with Historic England. It also underlines the value and importance of pre-application discussions with us on proposals with the potential for major change, or damage, to nationally important heritage assets. The principles set out in this charter should inform the Council’s consultation approach to significant planning applications.</p>	<p>1. Noted. The draft SCI appears to cover all the guidance set out in the charter but a reference to the document in a new ‘Future Guidance’ section. Partial change proposed.</p>