

APPENDIX B – Responses received to SCI consultation

Name of respondent	Comment	Response/Action taken
James Fox for HS2 Ltd	None to make	None
Cublington Parish Council	No comments other than Appendix 2 not referred to in document	Reference added
Andrew Morgan for Warwickshire and West Mercia Police	Welcome and support commitment to working with police. Would like to see explicit recognition of police and other emergency services involved in pre-application discussions. Suggest inclusion of Fire and Rescue services also. No planning application list of consultees as there is for policy document consultations	'Emergency services' added to list of consultees
Adrian Johnson, Highways England	Welcome commitment to early and ongoing consultation. Draw attention to latest guide on working with Highways England	Noted
Phil Clark, Baginton Parish Council	<p>The following have been suggested as additions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Under 2.4 add following new para:- In the absence of a Neighbourhood plan the views of Parish Councils, who represent the local electorate, shall be accounted for in Planning decisions. Under 2.4 add the following new para:-The Authority shall take account of the requirements of the Secretary Of State with regard to decisions made on land within the District Boundary in formulating the requirements of the Local Plan. Under 2.4 add the following new para:- The Authority will not make any changes to the extent of the Green Belt without making separate consultation with every affected property and shall take account of the wishes of local people in their deliberations. Under 2.4 add the following: The Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEP's) do not represent the views of the public affected by the proposals so shall be given no weight in the Authorities deliberations. Timescales page 9:- suggested 6 weeks is too short. Make this 10 (or 8?) weeks MIN to allow due process. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Views are always requested of and considered in planning decisions whether these are from Parish Councils or another source The authority may not wish to do this if the circumstances have changed after a SoS decision Consultations take place with regard to planning decisions affecting the Green Belt. It may not necessarily result in the wishes of local people being satisfied but their views are certainly taken into consideration The LEP is an organisation with the economic health of the district at its heart. We would therefore not discount any representation that the LEP

		<p>submits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The legislation calls for a 6 week consultation period and this is what we are adopting as our standard unless there are special circumstances for doing so and these are outlined in the SCI <p>These suggested amendments have not been made to the SCI for the above reasons</p>
Kenilworth Town Council	<p>Appreciate being consulted. Agree and support but with three additional comments:</p> <p>Paragraph 2.4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not surprisingly we agree with the statement "Town and Parish Councils are key partners in the planning application and plan making process and are becoming increasingly important through the introduction of Neighbourhood Plans". We have enjoyed a close working relationship with WDC Planning for many years and trust this will long continue. This will be indeed become increasingly relevant as we produce our Neighbourhood Plan. <p>Paragraph 3.6</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> We approve of the continuing ability of Town and Parish Councils to address the Planning Committee if they have objected to a planning application. On a point of detail this paragraph also refers to the Conservation Area Advisory Forum (CAAF), but surely this is now just the Conservation Advisory Forum (CAF)? <p>Appendix 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The list of Neighbouring Authorities should specifically include Solihull MBC with which Kenilworth has a common border 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted Agreed. This has been changed to read 'Conservation Advisory Forum (CAF)' Since the SCI lists 'adjoining local planning authorities' within the consultees, specific council's do not need to be

		named. This has always worked as the database contains each council by name and they are automatically notified at each event
Gemma McKinnon, Public Health Warwickshire	<p>Welcome the opportunity to comment.</p> <p>Would welcome the opportunity to be engaged with Warwick District Council throughout the Local Plan process and notified of forthcoming planning consultations including neighbourhood plans. Would also be useful to be notified of significant planning applications at an early stage to ensure that new developments promote healthy, active and sustainable communities and to be involved in pre-application discussions.</p> <p>In addition, advise that to ensure that local communities are well informed of opportunities for improving health and wellbeing throughout the Local Plan/Neighbourhood Plan processes, the two key planning documents (Public Health Evidence for Planning and Developers [draft] and; Neighbourhood Development Planning for Health) are considered when looking at new developments.</p> <p>Attached two planning guidance documents which aim to provide evidence and recommendations to support the development of healthy, active and sustainable communities</p>	Noted
Andy Thomas	<p>I believe that the local Driving Instructor Association would be a worthy addition to the list of consultees as it is very involved with and has a wide interest and experience of Highways issues (e.g. increased traffic movements throughout the area at all times of day. They (we) are representative of all road users, whether for personal or business use.</p>	<p>There is no reason why such organisations and individuals should not register to take part in consultations. This can be done by registering through the JDi consultation system on our website</p>