



## **REVISED STATEMENT OF COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT STATEMENT OF CONSULTATION – DECEMBER 2013**

### **1. Introduction**

- 1.1 The preparation of a Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) is a statutory requirement of the *Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004* and the Authority adopted its first SCI in 2007. The document sets out how we intend to engage with residents, businesses and other local organisations on planning and other matters relating to the Park and our consultations will be open to all who live in, work in and visit the New Forest National Park.
- 1.2 Since 2007 then there have been significant changes within the national planning system. In addition, following recent consultation on the Authority's draft Landscape Action Plan and Landscape Character Areas (during which questions were raised about how we consult on our wider work) it was considered to be an appropriate time to refresh the document.

### **2. Public consultation on the draft SCI**

- 2.1 As outlined above, the Authority's first SCI was adopted in 2007 following public consultation and independent examination by the Government's Planning Inspectorate. Since then, the legal planning requirements for the preparation of SCIs has changed and local planning authorities are no longer required to formally consult on the document and an examination is no longer held. The Authority however, wants to encourage people and organisations to get involved in its work and shape the places where they live, as a result public consultation was undertaken on the draft revised SCI, details of which are set out below.
- 2.2 Consultation commenced on Friday 4 October and concluded on Friday 22 November 2013 (a period of seven weeks). Copies of the document were available for inspection at the Authority's offices in Lymington. It could also be viewed and downloaded via the Authority's website. Statutory consultees and local organisations were sent copies or sent notification of the consultation. The consultation exercise was widely advertised through a press release issued by the Authority and also advertised via social media (Twitter and Facebook). A poster advertising the consultation was also sent to the Authority's designated Local Information Points for display during the consultation period. Articles on the consultation also featured in the Authority's e-newsletter which goes out to over 1,000 people.
- 2.3 During the seven week public consultation period, responses were received from 5 individuals, 11 organisations and the National Park Authority's technical officers. In total this amounted to 67 points raised.

2.4 The following bodies listed below were consulted prior to adoption of the SCI.

- Parish and Town Councils
- Adjoining local authorities
- Statutory bodies including Natural England, English Heritage, Highways Agency, Environment Agency, Southern Water, Primary Care Trusts, water companies, gas and electricity providers
- A total of 128 local bodies and groups representing a wide range of interests, such as Verderers of the New Forest, Forestry Commission, National Trust, New Forest Business Partnership, RSPB

**3. Main issues raised during the seven week public consultation**

3.1 The tables on the following pages summarise the main issues raised during the seven week public consultation period, and show how these issues have been addressed in the final version of the revised SCI. A number of changes have been made to the document in light of the consultation comments received. This highlights the value of the public consultation, and the detailed views submitted by consultees and welcomed.

Respondent Ref No.	Respondent	Comment ref no.	support/comment/object	page/chap/para no.	Comments	Proposed Amendment
1	Environment Agency	101	Comment	Whole document	No comments to make.	No changes required
2	Natural England	201	Support	Whole document	NE is supportive 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. Regret that NE is unable to comment, in detail on individual SCIs.	No changes required
3	Local Resident	301	Support	Whole document	Support the general content of the whole document.	Support welcomed
	Local Resident	302	Comment	para 7.3	Part of the direction of the RMS is trying to encourage recreational facilities on the Forest boundaries. Therefore suggest an extra word should be inserted as follows "..... <i>strategic policies on issues such as housing, <u>recreation</u>, minerals and infrastructure.</i> "	Agree. The Authority is actively discussing cross-boundary green infrastructure provision with a number of neighbouring authorities. Amend para. 7.3 to: "Under the 'duty to cooperate' we will also engage with neighbouring authorities around the Park to develop strategic policies on issues such as housing, <b>recreation</b> , minerals and infrastructure."
4	Minstead Parish Council	401	Support	Whole document	In general we find the document to be clear, concise and helpful in setting out the consultation procedures for revisions to documents on planning policy, planning applications and other strategy documents.	Support welcomed

Minstead Parish Council	402	Comment	para 8.3	Consultations should run for a 6 week minimum period to ensure that they can be considered at least one parish council monthly meeting as a 4 week consultation could fail to do this.	Agree - the relevant Planning Regulations state that consultation on a draft SPD should run for between 4 - 6 weeks. The Authority has committed to consulting for the 6 week maximum and therefore para. 8.3 should be amended to: "Before adopting a SPD, we will consult on a draft document for a period of <del>between 4 and 6 weeks.</del> " The second bullet point in SCI - 3 should also be amended to: "A draft SPD will then be published for a <del>4 to 6</del> week period of public consultation." Finally, para. 8.4 should be amended to: "...everyone who commented during the <del>4 to 6</del> week consultation period will be notified..."
Minstead Parish Council	403	Comment	para 10.1	Given the recent changes and proposed changes to Permitted Development Rights suggest that some reference is included as to how 'change of use' applications under the new rules will be notified to parish councils and neighbouring properties.	The revised PD rights require applicants to go through the process of 'Prior Approval'. Although this process is distinct from the usual planning application process, proposals are included within the weekly list of registered applications, a site notice is posted, neighbours are notified and the relevant Parish Council are notified. Details are also posted on the Authority's website.
Minstead Parish Council	404	Comment	para 10.5	Is it correct to assume that the list of applications to be considered by the Planning Development Control Committee should include all applications under the Commoners' Dwelling Scheme?	Agree - Paper NFNPA 432/13 confirmed that all proposals submitted under the Commoners' Dwelling Scheme would be considered by the PDCC. Amend para. 10.5 to: "These include applications referred by members; <b>applications submitted under the Commoners' Dwelling Scheme</b> ; applications referred by local district, borough or county councillors..."

5	Local Resident	501	Object	Section 10	Section 10 refers to planning applications. Despite clear guidance in the Authority's adopted Horse-Related Development SPD (2011), the Authority granted a LDC application at Newlands Farm with only limited restrictions. 50 acres of commoner's back-up grazing land has been lost. The site has direct access onto Ibsley Common SSSI and has increased pressures on this site.	Comments noted, but they refer to a specific site and application, rather than the SCI per se. Section 10 sets out how the Authority will engage people in the determination of planning applications and comments are invited on this, rather than the merits of a particular decision. No change.
---	----------------	-----	--------	------------	--	---

Local Resident	502	Object	General	The NPA must be aware of the implications for the New Forest from the Government's proposals to allow the possible conversion of farm buildings for up to 3 dwellings. There may be over 1,000 agricultural buildings in the New Forest that could be lost. Each dwelling could have 5 acres of agricultural land attached for the keeping of horses. It is another reminder to the NPA that they have to protect back-up grazing land in the New Forest.	The Authority is fully aware of the Government's proposed changes to permitted development rights. Following discussions at the Parish Quadrant meetings in the autumn , the Authority submitted a detailed response to the Government setting out its concerns regarding the potential impacts of the proposed changes (including the impacts they could have on commoning in the New Forest). No change.
----------------	-----	--------	---------	---	--

6	Test Valley Borough Council	601	Support	Para. 7.3	Test Valley Borough Council is pleased to note that reference has been made that the NPA, under the 'duty to cooperate', will engage with neighbouring authorities around the Park. The Council supports this paragraph and is committed to working with the NPA on strategic priorities.	Support welcomed
	Test Valley Borough Council	602		Appendix 1	Test Valley Borough Council supports Appendix 1 which identifies the Council as a statutory consultee for planning policy documents.	Support welcomed

7	Local Resident	701	Comment	para 2.1	Should also include mention of the intention to make planning jargon and detail accessible to the understanding of the general public i.e. need simplification, avoid complexity and bias.	Comments noted. Efforts have been made to make the document accessible and the glossary in Appendix 3 is designed to help the reader understand some of the more technical terms used. No change.
	Local Resident	702	Comment	para 7.2	Good to see NFNPA reiterating national planning guidelines in terms of involving communities at an early stage.	Comments noted.
	Local Resident	703	Comment	para 11.5	Is it correct to say that Park Life is distributed to residents throughout the Park. I have only ever received 2 copies in the early days; need to check with distributors.	Agree to amend. Park Life is now distributed twice a year within the New Forest Post weekly newspaper and is also available at community outlets including post offices within the National Park; Local Information Points; and local libraries. Amend para. 11.5 to: "We will wherever possible make use of the 'Park Life' newspaper which is <b>currently distributed twice a year within the New Forest Post weekly newspaper and also available at community outlets throughout the Forest.</b> <del>distributed to residents throughout the National Park twice a year.</del> "

Local Resident	704	Comment	Appendix 1	Need to include Country Landowners Association under Farming and land management bodies.	Appendix 1 sets out a "guide" to the types of stakeholders who will be consulted as appropriate. Although it is not intended to be a comprehensive list, given the Authority's close working with the Country Land & Business Association (CLA) it is agreed that they should be added to Appendix 1 under 'Farming and land management and local bodies'.
Local Resident	705	Comment	Appendix 1	Need to include Caravan Club and Camping and Caravanning Club under Tourism and accommodation providers.	Appendix 1 sets out a "guide" to the types of stakeholders who will be consulted as appropriate. It is not a comprehensive list and rather than add further (non-statutory) consultees to the list in a published document, it would be better to add them to the Authority's internal consultee database. No change.
Local Resident	706	Support	Whole document	Thank you for a Statement that, if followed, goes a long way to meeting public involvement requirements.	Support welcomed

8	English Heritage	801	Support	Whole document	English Heritage has no specific comments on the revised SCI, but would like to express their satisfaction with the consultations they receive from the NPA, both development management and planning policy.	Support welcomed.
---	------------------	-----	---------	----------------	---	-------------------

9	NFNPA member	901	Comment	para 10.6	Should more information be provided on the time allowed for public speaking at committee meetings, or is this covered in the Planning Charter?	Agree that some detail on the time for speaking at PDCC should be included. Amend para. 10.6: "The opportunity to speak is provided for the applicant, supporters or objectors to the application ( <b>who have up to 3 minutes</b> ), and Parish and Town Councils ( <b>who as representatives of the local community are not time limited</b> ).
	NFNPA member	902	Comment	Chapter 11 and Appendices	Need greater use of bold - this section seems weary.	Agree - all terms listed in the Glossary will be highlighted in bold within the text.
	NFNPA member	903	Comment	Appendix 3	All glossary terms to be in bold in text.	Agree - all terms listed in the Glossary will be highlighted in bold within the text.

10	Milford-on-Sea Parish Council	1001	Support	Whole document	Parish Council support the document in general.	Support welcomed
----	-------------------------------	------	---------	----------------	---	------------------

Milford-on-Sea Parish Council	1002	Comment	page 11, SCI-4	Would like to see the contents of residents' letters of support or objection to provide members of planning committee with more information about how the community feels on each application. This would help us make appropriate representations to each application. At present all we are told is of how many residents are for or against an application. Suggest adding the following bullet point to SCI-4 (or have a new SCI-7) - 'to publish all responses to planning applications on line (with necessary redactions).'	No changes are recommended to the document, although the comments from Milford-on-Sea Parish Council are acknowledged. The Authority shares the wish to publish all responses to planning applications online (with necessary redactions). The resource implications are currently being explored and it is hoped that this could be in place by Spring 2014.
-------------------------------	------	---------	----------------	--	---

11	Sway Parish Council	1101	Support	Whole document	Congratulations to the author(s) - a transparent, up-to-date and practical SCI. Significant improvement on the 2007 version. NFNPA are to be applauded for being more active in seeking input and for carefully considering and responding to the input it does receive e.g.. Landscape Action Plan and Landscape Character Assessments where every suggestion was considered and a response received.	Support welcomed.
	Sway Parish Council	1102	Comment	para 5.1	Figure isn't entirely clear; should there be more arrows to indicate hierarchy?	No changes are recommended. The diagram illustrates the main planning policy documents for the Park and the Glossary provides further details.
	Sway Parish Council	1103	Comment	para 7.4	A six week consultation period is referred to here (and throughout the document) - parish councils (or their planning committees) often meet in public on a monthly basis. Therefore to ensure that parish councils have one meeting where a matter is considered and a second where it is actually resolved would require a two month consultation (in case the start date is the day after one such meeting).	There is no formal requirement for public consultation at this point. However the Authority considers it useful to undertake initial consultation at this stage. Town and Parish Councils within the National Park will have been informed of forthcoming consultations through the Quadrant meetings and so should be able to coordinate their responses. No change.
	Sway Parish Council	1104	Comment	SCI - 2 page 7	Are the NFNPA providing resources for LIPs to have documents available for inspection? This seems a change in emphasis for LIPs from a basically tourist-supporting role to more of a local council support role. Where parish and town councils have an office open to the public would it not make better sense to use those?	SCI 2 states that "...details will be available at Local Information Points in the Park". In practice this means that a consultation poster will be displayed at the LIP and there will be no major resource implications for the LIP to display this information. In addition, it is the Authority's standard practice to send consultation posters to all Town and Parish Council clerks within the National Park for their parish notice boards. No change.

Sway Parish Council	1105	Comment	para 10.2	With increasing reliance on the web and tight deadlines for comments on planning applications, there should be a target for publishing of applications on the web, say within 3 working days of their registration (valid) date.	The Planning Administration Team makes every effort to validate applications quickly and most applications are uploaded to the website within 5 days. This is considered to be a realistic timetable given the administrative tasks that need to be undertaken. Naturally the team will continue to make every effort to upload the applications as quickly as possible. No change is recommended.
Sway Parish Council	1106	Comment	para 10.3	Is 21 days notice correct? Usually 35 days. If 21 days is correct (and were to be enforced) then parish councils should be given longer to comment, given that parish councils meet every month. Appreciate planning officers who are accommodating and allow longer than 21 days.	The Authority has to statutorily give 21 days notice from when the sites notice is posted for interested parties to respond. However, the site notice may not be posted until up to a couple of weeks after the validation of the application. Therefore in essence, whilst not statutory, the Authority gives Parish Councils 35 days within which to respond. Recommend that para. 10.3 is amended to "All applications are scanned and published on our website and site notices give the date by which comments should be made <b>(21 days is the statutory minimum)</b> ( <del>usually within 21 days</del> )." <b>21 days</b> ."
Sway Parish Council	1107	Comment	SCI- 4	As above, posting of weekly list is not timely. Suggest that new applications once accepted as valid should be posted on website within 3 working days of their registration (validation) date.	The Planning Administration Team makes every effort to validate applications quickly and most applications are uploaded to the website within 5 days. This is considered to be a realistic timetable given the administrative tasks that need to be undertaken. Naturally the team will continue to make every effort to upload the applications as quickly as possible. No change is recommended.
Sway Parish Council	1108	Comment	para 10.4	The rules on requiring respondents to quote both a property address and application number need to be made clearer on the website and on notices to neighbours. A full address of the person responding should also be requested.	It is considered that the guidance on site notices and letters to residents are sufficient to ensure that responses are directed to the correct application and case officer. It is considered that the full address of the respondent is not necessary and is not usually provided anyway if the respondent is replying by email. No change is recommended.
Sway Parish Council	1109	Comment	para 10.5	We believe current practise is to refer to the Planning Development Control Committee any application where a member or officer has a pecuniary interest . This is good practice and could be included here as an example of good governance.	Agree - where members or officers have a clear pecuniary interest it is standard practice for the application to be referred to PDCC for determination. Amend para. 10.5 to: "...applications which are contrary to the Authority's approved policies which or recommended for approval; <b>or where an NPA officer of member has a clear pecuniary interest.</b> "

Sway Parish Council	1110	Comment	para 10.6	The Planning Development Control Committee also now allow a 'right of reply' to be extended to parish and town councils and this should be noted in this paragraph.	Agree - following feedback from the Parish Quadrant meetings the Authority recently introduced the 'right of reply' for Town and Parish Councils. Add the following sentence to the end of para. 10.6: <b>"All speakers have the 'right of reply' during discussions on planning applications considered by the Planning Development Control Committee."</b>
Sway Parish Council	1111	Comment	para 11.7 box bullet point 2	Advising people to 'keep an eye on' a given webpage is far from ideal. Generally regarded as underhand and unduly onerous cop-out approach. Why not offer a twitter feed or hash tag, RSS feed or an email notification option? The monthly newsletter is not frequent enough to give notice of consultations.	Comments noted and acknowledged. The revised SCI sets out a range of ways through which people can be kept informed of the Authority's consultations - including Twitter, the e-newsletter - and this is considered to be appropriate. No change recommended.
Sway Parish Council	1112	Comment	Appendix 1	Consider adding Hampshire Association of Local Councils, LIPs and New Forest Transition. Consider removing One Voice as doesn't meet very often (met only once in 2008) and has no formal constitution or membership, last few years seems to have been work of just one person.	Appendix 1 sets out a "guide" to the types of stakeholders who will be consulted as appropriate. It is not a comprehensive list and rather than add further (non-statutory) consultees to the list in a published document, it would be better to add them to the Authority's internal consultee database. No change.
Sway Parish Council	1113	Comment	Appendix 2	Add Sway Deli's website and email address (as per details supplied).	It is acknowledged that Local Information Points within the National Park can change over time. <b>It is therefore recommended that Appendix 2 is amended to include a link to the relevant page on the Authority's website, rather than listing all of the current LIPs (which could date the document quickly).</b>
Sway Parish Council	1114	Comment	Appendix 3	Consider adding VDSs and Neighbourhood Plan.	Agree - <b>include 'Village Design Statements' and 'Neighbourhood Plans' within the Glossary (Appendix 3)</b>
Sway Parish Council	1115	Comment	Whole document	Consider adding an appendix of the URLs of significant links.	Comments noted and URL links have been added where appropriate.
Sway Parish Council	1116	Comment	Whole document	This document is not as strong as adopted SCI on considering 'hard to reach' groups. Need to consider engaging with elderly (as lot of elderly people live in Forest) and young (as they will have to live with the consequences of the adopted planning decisions etc). Consider Village Agents or Older Persons Champions or engaging more with younger adults particularly through social media	Comments noted. The revised SCI does seek to engage younger people through things like the Authority's Facebook page (which has over 1,500 'friends') and Twitter feed (which has over 7,000 followers). The Authority also routinely consults bodies Age UK to ensure that the views of the elderly community are gathered. Recommend no change.

Sway Parish Council	1117	Comment	Para 10.9	While planning applications are covered well, enforcement matters are not mentioned. Consider adding a reference 'Following from the adoption of the Local Enforcement Plan the NFNPA will consult the appropriate parish council(s) on enforcement investigations.'	Agree - insert the following wording after paragraph 10.7: " <b>We rely upon the help of the public to bring suspected breaches of planning control to our attention. All such reports are treated in confidence. The Authority has an adopted Local Enforcement Plan (2013) which gives advice on how town and parish councils and members of the public can report breaches of planning control. The Plan sets out how we keep people informed about an investigation as it progresses. A summary of all current enforcement cases, describing the nature of the alleged breach and the relevant stage of the investigation, is sent each month to all town and parish councils and uploaded onto the Authority's website.</b> "
Sway Parish Council	1118	Comment	Whole document	It is stated in the document (para 7.5 for example) that a Statement of Consultation is posted on the Authority's website - is it the current practice that they are then removed once document has been approved? Would it not be better to leave them on the website to provide a transparent audit trail? Could be placed in an archive at little additional cost.	It is standard practice that the 'Statement of Consultation' is removed from the Authority's website once a document has been adopted, and the period for legal challenge has elapsed (3 months after adoption of a SPD, and 6 weeks for a DPD). Copies for the Statements remain available for inspection or on request. No change is recommended.
Sway Parish Council	1119	Comment	para 10.3	Para 11.2 of the adopted version refers to certain cases where developers have responsibility for publicising planning applications (permitted development rights). There is a danger that a less than scrupulous developer might not do this with due diligence. NPA needs to ensure that such publicity reaches the local community, for example via a standard note to parish councils. Include something along these lines in this version.	Agree - insert the following text after para. 10.3: " <b>The role of publicising the majority of applications falls to the local planning authority, although in certain cases related to Permitted Development rights of statutory undertakers, the developer has the responsibility of carrying out the publicity.</b> "

Sway Parish Council	1120	Comment	para 10.5	Para 11.6 of the adopted version states that 'All written objections are reported to the PDCC and members then consider these comments in determining the application.' This is currently not happening, comments from the parish council are often paraphrased or summarised by the planning officer. The officers usually do an excellent and unbiased job in reporting on these comments, however, they may be biased and report comments which support their recommendation. Therefore recommend that all written comments should be made available to PDCC members.	The comments from Sway Parish Council are acknowledged. However, it remains necessary for the Authority's officers to have the ability to summarise the main points made by consultees, and not be bound to report comments verbatim. To reassure Town and Parish Councils the Authority allows them unlimited speaking time at Planning Committee and has also introduced the right of reply, therefore ensuring they have the full opportunity to express their views. No change is recommended.
Sway Parish Council	1121	Comment	para 10.3	Following on from the adopted 2007 version, in our experience (for example 12/97417 Land of High Forest) neighbours are not re-notified of significant changes in planning applications. Also important to include parish councils in that re-notification. Include the following 'Where planning amendments are deemed, or might be felt to be, significant, neighbours and parish councils will be re-notified and there will be an additional 21 day period of consultation.'	The Authority is aware of the issue raised in relation to the specific application mentioned and has responded directly to the relevant parties. Naturally the Authority will seek to re-consult on amended plans if the amendments are considered to be significant and provide an additional period for interested parties to submit a response. No change is recommended
Sway Parish Council	1122	Comment	Whole document	There is no mention in the SCI of local consultations regarding Tree Work applications. This has been highlighted by a local example (High Forest, Manchester Road, Sway). This needs to be rectified.	The introduction to section 10 of the revised SCI states that the Authority deals with around 1,600 applications a year, including applications for works to trees protected by TPOs and applications for works to trees in Conservation Areas. Town and Parish Councils currently receive a weekly list of Tree Work applications and decisions and all such applications are available to view online or at the Authority's office. Neighbours are also notified where appropriate. Recommend no change.

12	Brockenhurst Parish Council	1201	Comment	Whole document	Various mechanisms have been put in place for consultation - NFNPA needs to ensure that this consultation is genuine in its purpose and that views accepted are acted upon. For example, it goes against genuine consultation when parish councils views are ignored by members of PDCC when decisions are made on planning applications.	Comments noted. The Authority has gone to great lengths to actively engage Town and Parish Councils in its work and significantly exceeds the statutory requirements. A wide range of methods are used to do this. Town and Parish Councils remain an important consultee on planning applications, and this is reflected by the fact they have unlimited time to speak at Planning Committee, and the recently introduced right of reply. It should also be noted that the vast majority of planning applications are determined in accordance with the views of the relevant Town or Parish Council. No change is recommended.
	Brockenhurst Parish Council	1202	Comment	Whole document	Quadrant meetings are useful sounding boards for dialogue between parish councils and NFNPA. Mechanisms are needed to (i) ensure that members chairing the meetings report back to full Authority meetings; (ii) members engage fully in the issues discussed; (iii) decisions and the reasons for them are reported back to subsequent meeting; and (iv) Authority's Annual Report should recommend the number of times when a Quadrant meeting leads to a change in policy.	Meetings notes are prepared for all of the Parish Quadrant meetings and discussions that take place at the Quadrant meetings are fed back to relevant officers / members. This has resulted in presentations to the following Quadrant meetings, or in the case of the proposal from Brockenhurst Parish Council for Parish Councils to have a right of reply at PDCC, discussions originating at the Quadrant meeting led to the Authority changing its procedures accordingly. No changes recommended.
	Brockenhurst Parish Council	1203	Comment	Whole document	Disappointing that direct elections were abandoned. Essential that local members are involved in local decisions, for example, no attempt was made by the Authority to engage local member in recent cycling bid for Brockenhurst.	The decision not to progress with the proposed pilot direct elections in National Parks was Central Government's, and not a local decision. The NFNPA volunteered to take part in this trial.
	Brockenhurst Parish Council	1204	Comment	Whole document	Request that consultation is; a positive, enthusiastic first reaction	Comments noted - the Authority undertakes extensive consultation on a wide range of issues, and exceeds the statutory minimum in every case.
	Brockenhurst Parish Council	1205	Comment	Whole document	Request that formal procedures should be in place to ensure that consultation features as an agenda item on every Authority meeting.	Every document or plan formally adopted by the National Park Authority (e.g. Core Strategy, SPDs, RMS, Landscape Plan etc) is done so in a public meeting and is routinely accompanied by a 'Statement of Consultation' which sets out in detail who was consulted during its preparation; through what methods; and how their views have informed the final document. No further changes are recommended.

	Brockenhurst Parish Council	1206	Comment	Whole document	Topics raised in consultation should be openly debated without the barrier of pre-conceived (or misconceived) positions.	Comments noted.
	Brockenhurst Parish Council	1207	Comment	Whole document	Conclusions of such debates should be communicated back to local consultative bodies with an exposition of the reasons for accepting or refusing the conclusions of the original conclusion.	As well as the 'Statements of Consultation' outlined above, the Authority also makes active use of the Parish Quadrant meetings and the New Forest Consultative Panel to feed information back to local consultative bodies. No change is recommended.

13	The New Forest Verderers	1301	Support	Whole document	Support for the measures for consultation as outlined in the statement.	Support welcomed.
	The New Forest Verderers	1302	Comment	para 11.7	Prior consultation, or information would be welcome on certain projects affecting the forest, particularly if they might require agreement from the Verderers at some stage. Finding out through the press is not ideal. We could consider signing up for e-newsletter which may resolve this to some extent.	As noted by the Verderers, sign up to the Authority's monthly e-newsletter could assist in this. No change recommended.

14	Sway Parish Councillor	1401	Comment	Chap 10 or 11	There is no mention of the Authority's consultation procedures on TPOs or when a Tree Work Application is received. Currently good practice of the Tree Team (copies are sent to parish council and immediate neighbours are notified) is not reflected anywhere in the document and this should be rectified. Suggest including the following 'The Authority's Tree Team will continue to forward copies of all Tree Preservation Orders and Tree Work Applications to the appropriate parish council; as well as send notification letters to those upon whose land the trees in question grow; as well as immediate neighbours. The Tree Team will receive and consider timely responses from both parish council and neighbours, bearing in mind DCLG guidance, the NFNPA Core Strategy, the recommendations of the Arboricultural Association and any appropriate Village Design Statement.'	The introduction to section 10 of the revised SCI states that the Authority deals with around 1,600 applications a year, including applications for works to trees protected by TPOs and applications for works to trees in Conservation Areas. Town and Parish Councils currently receive a weekly list of Tree Work applications and decisions and all such applications are available to view online or at the Authority's office. Neighbours are also notified where appropriate. Recommend no change.
----	------------------------	------	---------	---------------	---	--

15	New Milton Town Council	1501	Comment	para 8.3	We request a minimum of 6 weeks rather than 4. It isn't always possible due to individual holiday commitments, parish council committee timetable etc to always meet a 4 week deadline. It is also noted in para 11.3 box bullet point 1 that a minimum 6 week consultation will be undertaken for the Authority's 'other work'. This is unfair.	Agree - the relevant Planning Regulations state that consultation on a draft SPD should run for between 4 - 6 weeks. The Authority has committed to consulting for the 6 week maximum and therefore para. 8.3 should be amended to: "Before adopting a SPD, we will consult on a draft document for a period of <del>between 4 and 6 weeks.</del> " The second bullet point in SCI - 3 should also be amended to: "A draft SPD will then be published for a <del>4 to 6</del> week period of public consultation." Finally, para. 8.4 should be amended to: "...everyone who commented during the <del>4 to 6</del> week consultation period will be notified..."
	New Milton Town Council	1502	Comment	para 10.3	SCI-4 lists issues that are considered 'in addition' to statutory requirements' yet they are part of statutory requirement, for example displaying a site notice and notifying individual neighbours by letter. As a result it is misleading.	Agree that SCI 4 as currently worded is slightly misleading. It is recommended that SCI 4 is amended to: " <b>The Authority will publicise planning applications in accordance with established national standards, which will include:</b> <del>in addition to the statutory requirements established at a national level, the Authority will apply its own strategy for effectively publicising</del> <b>planning applications to include:</b> (i) posting of site notices; (ii) a weekly list of new applications posted on the Authority's website; (iii) delivery of neighbour notification letters to relevant properties; and (iv) making documents available to view at our offices."

16	The New Forest Equestrian Association	1601	Comment	Whole document	Would welcome the inclusion of a clear statement of the Authority's 'aims' for community involvement, as often provided by other local authorities. For example a commitment to openness, transparency and inclusion would be particularly welcome.	Comments acknowledged. The adopted SCI from 2007 did have a clear statement and it is agreed that the revised SCI would benefit from the inclusion of a similar statement setting out the Authority's commitment to community engagement. The following wording is proposed for inclusion after paragraph 1.1. <b>"Overall Aim for Community Involvement: The local community and a wide range of interest groups will be fully involved and engaged in the Authority's work so that everyone has the chance to help shape the future of the New Forest National Park. This document has been prepared to guide the Authority's more formal work, including the preparation of planning policy documents and other plans and strategies. We will help the community and other interests be aware of planning applications, to understand what is proposed, to express their views on the proposals, and to be informed of the Authority's decision. We are committed to engaging people using a wide range of methods and will report in a transparent manner how comments have been taken into account."</b>
	The New Forest Equestrian Association	1602	Comment	Whole document	Need to avoid a formulaic approach to consultation, for example in the case of the Landscape Action Plan; excessive reliance on poorly-attended and little known quadrant meetings and workshops. Too often the Authority allows policy meetings to be conducted on an invitation only and closed basis. Local community then has to rely on obtaining the information via Freedom of Information Act, for example the new Recreation Management Strategy Advisory Group and the associated Steering Group and for the Cycle Working Group. Such groups should follow the example of statutory organisations, such as Local Access Forums.	The revised Statement of Community Involvement places a greater emphasis on involving the general public in the Authority's work. Statutory consultees are fairly well provided for within the relevant Government consultation regulations and therefore the revised document emphasises how other people can get involved and be kept informed of the Authority's work via Twitter, the e-newsletter and the consultations section on the Authority's website for example. No changes recommended.

The New Forest Equestrian Association	1603	Comment	Whole document	The Authority should proactively share information with the larger community and not just with large representative groups such as the New Forest Equestrian Association. There is a culture of secrecy and exclusion that persists and this is unacceptable. The new SCI represents an ideal opportunity to replace this culture by providing a very clear statement of principles around openness, transparency and inclusion.	The revised Statement of Community Involvement sets out the Authority's overall aim for community engagement. All documents that are presented for formal adoption by the Authority are accompanied by a detailed Statement of Consultation setting out who was consulted, how and a summary of the main comments is also provided, setting out how they have been taken on board. In addition, planning documents such as the Local Plan will go through independent Examination and the Authority is committed to exceeding statutory standards for consultation in all its work. No changes are recommended.
---------------------------------------	------	---------	----------------	--	---

INTERNAL COMMENTS

17	Recreation & Learning	1701	comment	Appendix 2	New Forest Centre is included as a LIP, however, it technically speaking it is not. This an perhaps other venues that fit into a similar category (e.g. Lepe, Fordingbridge Information Office) should perhaps be called 'other information points' or the like. LIPs also change over time, would it be more appropriate for the list to become a link to the relevant page on our website?	It is acknowledged that Local Information Points within the National Park can change over time. <b>It is therefore recommended that Appendix 2 is amended to include a link to the relevant page on the Authority's website, rather than listing all of the current LIPs (which could date the document quickly).</b>
18	Planning Admin	1801	comment	para 10.2	Bullet point 1 implies that pre-application advice is given over the phone, this is not the case as normally DC officers would advise callers to write in to obtain pre-application advice. It is difficult for DC officers to give full on the spot advice as they will not have the site history to hand. Also need to refer to our email address dev.control@newforestnpa.gov.uk	Comments noted. Agree that a link to the Development Control email address should be included, along with some additional wording to the first bullet point in paragraph 10.2 as follows: <b>"The Authority encourages people wanting formal pre-application advice to write in....Applicants and other interested parties can also telephone or write to the office or email dev.control@newforestnpa.gov.uk."</b>
	Planning Admin	1802	comment	para 10.3	It is stated that all planning applications will be publicised by a site notice and neighbour notification letters. It may be misleading to the general public as not all planning applications are advertised in this way e.g. Lawful Development Certificate Proposal, Non Material Amendment, etc. Additionally not all application documents are available on the web e.g. LDCP, Prior Notification.	It is acknowledged that the reference to 'planning applications in paragraphs 10.1 and 10.3 could be clarified. It is therefore recommended that para. 10.1 to be amended to: "The Authority is the local planning authority for the National Park and deals with around 1600 planning applications a year."

Planning Admin	1803	comment	para 10.4	Need to also add that comments on planning applications can also be made online via our website.	Comments noted. Agree that para. 10.4 should be amended to: "Comments on applications should be made in writing (or email) and should quote the planning application number, the address of the property to which it relates, and your own address. <b>Comments on planning applications can also be made online via the Authority's website.</b> "
Planning Admin	1804	comment	para 10.6	Refers to at least 48 hours before the date of the meeting. Would be more consistent with Development Control Charter if it referred to "two working days."	Agree - for clarity para. 10.6 should be amended to: "People who wish to speak on individual items must register their interest at least <del>48 hours</del> <b>two working days</b> before the date of the meeting." To ensure consistency, SCI 5 should also be amended accordingly: "...for those who have registered their interest at least <b>two working days</b> <del>48 hours</del> before the date of the meeting."
Planning Admin	1805	comment	para 10.7	This encourages people to view the DC Charter, but may be better to suggest people view the planning section of the website as this breaks down the planning process as well as mentioning the charter, thereby hopefully providing better information.	Agree - to ensure that information remains up to date paragraph 10.7 should be amended to: "More information on the planning application process can be viewed <del>in the Authority's Development Control Charter which can be viewed</del> on the Authority's website at <b><a href="http://www.newforestnpa.gov.uk/info/20132/planning_processes/12/planning_application_process">www.newforestnpa.gov.uk/info/20132/planning_processes/12/planning_application_process</a></b> <del>www.newforestnpa.gov.uk.</del> "