East Lindsey
Statement of Community Involvement
Responses to Submitted Document
November 2006

This document contains a copy of each of the 56 responses made to the consultation on the Submitted (Regulation 28) version of the Council's Statement of Community Involvement.

Consultation on the Statement of Community Involvement Submission document took place between 9th October and 20th November 2006.

East Lindsey
DISTRICT COUNCIL

Index of Responses

Ref	*Search Name*	*Organisation/Reps of Behalf of*
SCI 201	MAREHAM LE FEN PC	Mareham Le Fen Parish Council
SCI 202	ELLIOTT	
SCI 203	STICKFORD PC	Stickford Parish Council
SCI 204	ROE	
SCI 205	GOODMAN	Voice of Chapel
SCI 206	CHAPEL PC	Chapel St Leonards Parish Council
SCI 207	SKEGNESS TC	Skegness Town Council
SCI 208	FFT	FFT (Friends, Families & Travellers)
SCI 209	FRITHVILLE PC	Frithville & Westville Parish Council
SCI 210	FRITHVILLE	Frithville & Westville Parish Council
SCI 211	HODGES	
SCI 212	BILSBY PC	Bilsby & Farlesthorpe Parish Council
SCI 213	BESTWICK	Lakeside Park
SCI 214	PACK	
SCI 215	MABLETHORPE TC	Mablethorpe & Sutton Town Council
SCI 216	ANTONY ASPBURY	Antony Aspbury Associates
SCI 217	PEACOCK & SMITH	Peacock & Smith (for Wm Morrison
SCI 218	REGIONAL ASSEMBLY	East Midlands Regional Assembly
SCI 219	LANGRIVILLE PC	Langriville Parish Council
SCI 220	ROBERTS	
SCI 221	THEATRES TRUST	The Theatres Trust
SCI 222	LCC	Lincolnshire County Council
SCI 223	CHARLES RUSSELL	Charles Russell LLP (for Broadgate
SCI 224	SALTFLEETBY PC	Saltfleetby Parish Council
SCI 225	THEDDLETHORPE PC	Theddlethorpe Parish Council
SCI 226	CLARK	
SCI 227	BRADLEY	
SCI 228	EVANS	
SCI 229	NATIONAL TRUST	The National Trust
SCI 230	MALTBY LE MARSH PC	Maltby Le Marsh Parish Council
SCI 231	MERTON COLLEGE	RPS Planning (for Merton College)
SCI 232	CAPP TRUST	RPS Planning (for Capp Trust)

Ref	*Search Name*	*Organisation/Reps of Behalf of*
SCI 233	SHUCKSMITH	RPS Planning (for Mr Shucksmith)
SCI 234	WRISDALE	RPS Planning (for Mr M Wrisdale)
SCI 235	ROUGHTON	RPS Planning (for Mr S B Roughton)
SCI 236	MADDISON	RPS Planning (for Maddison Family)
SCI 237	HOWELL	RPS Planning (for Mr R Howell)
SCI 238	GRAVES	RPS Planning (for AE Graves & Son)
SCI 239	DAWSON	RPS Planning (for L G Dawson)
SCI 240	CLARK	RPS Planning (for AJ Clark Settlement
SCI 241	CAULDWELL	RPS Planning (for Mr R Cauldwell)
SCI 242	WESLEY	RPS Planning (for Mr & Mrs Wesley)
SCI 243	NORBURN	RPS Planning (for Mr Norburn)
SCI 244	HOLTON	RPS Planning (for The Holton
SCI 245	GREETHAM	RPS Planning (for Mr J Greetham)
SCI 246	FIDDLING	RPS Planning (for Mrs B Fiddling)
SCI 247	JONES	Langriville Parish Council
SCI 248	HBF	Home Builders Federation
SCI 249	BELCHFORD & FULLETBY	Belchford & Fulletby P C
SCI 250	MOODY	Brown & Co (On behalf of John
SCI 251	GOEM	Government Office for the East
SCI 252	DRAYCOTT	
SCI 253	PARTNEY & DALBY PC	Partney & Dalby Parish Council
SCI 254	HEMINGBY PC	Hemingby Parish Council
SCI 255	WOLDS	Wolds Business Initiative
SCI 256	HART	
SCI 257	ORBY PC	Orby Parish Council
SCI 258	SCAMBLESBY PC	Scamblesby with Cawkwell Parish
SCI 259	VOLUNTARY	Voluntary Action East Lindsey
SCI 260	BEESBY	Beesby Residents Association
SCI 261	WOODHALL SPA PC	Woodhall Spa Parish Council

East Lindsey Local Development Framework Statement Of Community Involvement Log of Responses to Submission Document

Response Number **SCI 201**	On Behalf of:
Name Mr R E **Daubney**	**Mareham Le Fen Parish Council**

Test 1 Yes

Test 2 Yes

Test 3 Yes

Test 4 Yes

Test 5 Consultation has been taken to excess. I can not imagine what else could have been done.

Test 6 Yes

Test 7 Yes

Test 8 Yes

Test 9 Yes

General Comment

Wish to Appear at Examination **No** Wish to be notified of Outcome **Yes**

Date Received **19/10/06**

East Lindsey Local Development Framework Statement Of Community Involvement Log of Responses to Submission Document

Response Number **SCI 202**	On Behalf of:
Name Mr A **Elliott**	

Test 1 (Ticked)

Test 2 (Ticked)

Test 3 (Ticked)

Test 4 (Ticked)

Test 5 (Ticked)

Test 6 (Ticked)

Test 7 (Ticked)

Test 8 (Ticked)

Test 9 No. All planning applications should be posted with a site notice so local people are aware. Not everyone is on the 'net', ie. the elderly etc.

General Comment

Wish to Appear at Examination **Yes** Wish to be notified of Outcome **Yes**

Date Received **20/10/06**

East Lindsey Local Development Framework Statement Of Community Involvement Log of Responses to Submission Document

Response Number **SCI 203**	On Behalf of:
Name Mrs P **Bryant**	**Stickford Parish Council**

Test 1 Yes

Test 2 Yes

Test 3 Yes

Test 4 We would prefer earlier involvement rather meeting a minimum requirement.

Test 5 Broadly agree

Test 6 Agree

Test 7 Agree

Test 8 Agree

Test 9 We would prefer earlier involvement rather meeting a minimum requirement.

General Comment

Wish to Appear at Examination **No** Wish to be notified of Outcome **Yes**

Date Received **24/10/06**

East Lindsey Local Development Framework Statement Of Community Involvement Log of Responses to Submission Document

Response Number **SCI 204**	On Behalf of:
Name Mr JFJ **Roe**	

Test 1 It would appear so

Test 2 Generally speaking yes

Test 3 yes

Test 4 Yes

Test 5 Yes

Test 6 I do not know

Test 7 Yes

Test 8 It would seem so

Test 9 Yes

General Comment THREE copies of letter received - excessive

Wish to Appear at Examination **No** Wish to be notified of Outcome **No**

Date Received **31/10/06**

East Lindsey Local Development Framework Statement Of Community Involvement Log of Responses to Submission Document

Response Number **SCI 205**	On Behalf of:
Name Mr M **Goodman**	**Voice of Chapel**

Test 1 Agree

Test 2 Agree

Test 3 Would like to see more involvement by the residents

Test 4 Agree but would like to see local committee decisions

Test 5 Would like to see a committee formed by different groups

Test 6 Agree

Test 7 Each village and town should have a say in its own planning. The planning dept should take more notice.

Test 8 Agree

Test 9 Needs looking at

General Comment

Wish to Appear at Examination **Yes** Wish to be notified of Outcome **Yes**

Date Received **01/11/06**

East Lindsey Local Development Framework Statement Of Community Involvement Log of Responses to Submission Document

Response Number **SCI 206**	On Behalf of:
Name Mrs P M **Hibbert**	**Chapel St Leonards Parish Council**

Test 1 Yes

Test 2 Yes

Test 3 yes

Test 4 Yes

Test 5 Yes - still less jargon needed though.

Test 6 On paper SCI complies, will reality agree

Test 7 Yes

Test 8 Yes

Test 9 Yes - wider neighbour consultation required

General Comment

Wish to Appear at Examination **No** Wish to be notified of Outcome **Yes**

Date Received **02/11/06**

East Lindsey Local Development Framework Statement Of Community Involvement Log of Responses to Submission Document

Response Number **SCI 207**	On Behalf of:
Name Mr A **Crawshaw**	**Skegness Town Council**

Test 1 Yes

Test 2 Yes

Test 3 Yes

Test 4 Yes

Test 5 Yes

Test 6 Not in a position to comment

Test 7 Yes

Test 8 Yes

Test 9 Yes

General Comment

Wish to Appear at Examination **Yes** Wish to be notified of Outcome **Yes**

Date Received **02/11/06**

East Lindsey Local Development Framework Statement Of Community Involvement Log of Responses to Submission Document

Response Number **SCI 208**	On Behalf of:
Name Mr S J **Staines**	**FFT (Friends, Families & Travellers)**

Test 1

Test 2

Test 3 We feel that the SCI is unsound because there is no direct mention of Gypsies and Travellers, we are concerned that the specific measures outlined may be unproductive…East Lindsey has a significant number of Gypsy caravans according to the ODPM (Nw DCLG) caravan count, mainly without authorised sites. The CRE recommends that Gypsies and Travellers should be specifically mentioned in SCIs. In particular we draw your attention to para 29 of the Circular 1/2006 'Local planning authorities should put in place arrangements so that communication with gypsies and travellers is direct and accessible. Identifying and understanding the needs of groups who find it difficult, for a number of reasons, to engage with the planning process is essential'. Your SCI does not in out opinion do this and should be revised to take into account our concerns. Gypsies and Travellers can be viewed as having very small accommodation needs when compared for example the need for planning provision for bricks and mortar accommodation for the general population, and hence are easily overlooked. The current revisions in planning policy and hopefully proper provision after many years of woeful neglect, represent a chance to get this deeply marginalized and under-engaged group more involved with the planning process with positive outcomes for all concerned. Their needs have been neglected for many years and this is something which the new Circular is attempting to address. We do note that the Gypsy Traveller Law Reform Coalition (now defunct) is mentioned in an appendix as is the Gypsy Council but we have concerns that Local Authorities may overestimate the capacity of hard pressed national voluntary bodies to respond, and inter alia provide links, and as a direct result local consultation may be neglected or overlooked. It should be pointed out that in many areas there is little in the way of organisation and literacy problems, together with a past history of negative involvement with public bodies, means that barriers to engagement with this group can be very large and can only realistically be addressed by proactive work by local authorities at local level…Additionally their needs may have been neglected within the BME voluntary sector generally. Hence the ise of representative organisations cannot be a reliable sole means of communcation. We are of the opinion that this section needs revision and more effective means of communication developed and identified in the specific measures. In our view local councils such as East Lindsey must reach out creatively in an effective manner, for example by initiating and sustaining contact with Gypsies and Travellers on their own territory, such that their needs and views can be ascertained and feed into the plan process. One of the

reasons why the planning system has failed this community in the past has been the almost total lack of direct contact over policy matters which directly affect them.

Test 4 We feel that the SCI is unsound because there is no direct mention of Gypsies and Travellers, we are concerned that the specific measures outlined may be unproductive…East Lindsey has a significant number of Gypsy caravans according to the ODPM (Nw DCLG) caravan count, mainly without authorised sites. The CRE recommends that Gypsies and Travellers should be specifically mentioned in SCIs. In particular we draw your attention to para 29 of the Circular 1/2006 'Local planning authorities should put in place arrangements so that communication with gypsies and travellers is direct and accessible. Identifying and understanding the needs of groups who find it difficult, for a number of reasons, to engage with the planning process is essential'. Your SCI does not in out opinion do this and should be revised to take into account our concerns. Gypsies and Travellers can be viewed as having very small accommodation needs when compared for example the need for planning provision for bricks and mortar accommodation for the general population, and hence are easily overlooked. The current revisions in planning policy and hopefully proper provision after many years of woeful neglect, represent a chance to get this deeply marginalized and under-engaged group more involved with the planning process with positive outcomes for all concerned. Their needs have been neglected for many years and this is something which the new Circular is attempting to address. We do note that the Gypsy Traveller Law Reform Coalition (now defunct) is mentioned in an appendix as is the Gypsy Council but we have concerns that Local Authorities may overestimate the capacity of hard pressed national voluntary bodies to respond, and inter alia provide links, and as a direct result local consultation may be neglected or overlooked. It should be pointed out that in many areas there is little in the way of organisation and literacy problems, together with a past history of negative involvement with public bodies, means that barriers to engagement with this group can be very large and can only realistically be addressed by proactive work by local authorities at local level…Additionally their needs may have been neglected within the BME voluntary sector generally. Hence the ise of representative organisations cannot be a reliable sole means of communcation. We are of the opinion that this section needs revision and more effective means of communication developed and identified in the specific measures. In our view local councils such as East Lindsey must reach out creatively in an effective manner, for example by initiating and sustaining contact with Gypsies and Travellers on their own territory, such that their needs and views can be ascertained and feed into the plan process. One of the reasons why the planning system has failed this community in the past has been the almost total lack of direct contact over policy matters which directly affect them.

Test 5 We feel that the SCI is unsound because there is no direct mention of Gypsies and Travellers, we are concerned that the specific measures outlined may be unproductive…East Lindsey has a significant number of Gypsy caravans

according to the ODPM (Nw DCLG) caravan count, mainly without authorised sites. The CRE recommends that Gypsies and Travellers should be specifically mentioned in SCIs. In particular we draw your attention to para 29 of the Circular 1/2006 'Local planning authorities should put in place arrangements so that communication with gypsies and travellers is direct and accessible. Identifying and understanding the needs of groups who find it difficult, for a number of reasons, to engage with the planning process is essential'. Your SCI does not in out opinion do this and should be revised to take into account our concerns. Gypsies and Travellers can be viewed as having very small accommodation needs when compared for example the need for planning provision for bricks and mortar accommodation for the general population, and hence are easily overlooked. The current revisions in planning policy and hopefully proper provision after many years of woeful neglect, represent a chance to get this deeply marginalized and under-engaged group more involved with the planning process with positive outcomes for all concerned. Their needs have been neglected for many years and this is something which the new Circular is attempting to address. We do note that the Gypsy Traveller Law Reform Coalition (now defunct) is mentioned in an appendix as is the Gypsy Council but we have concerns that Local Authorities may overestimate the capacity of hard pressed national voluntary bodies to respond, and inter alia provide links, and as a direct result local consultation may be neglected or overlooked. It should be pointed out that in many areas there is little in the way of organisation and literacy problems, together with a past history of negative involvement with public bodies, means that barriers to engagement with this group can be very large and can only realistically be addressed by proactive work by local authorities at local level…Additionally their needs may have been neglected within the BME voluntary sector generally. Hence the ise of representative organisations cannot be a reliable sole means of communcation. We are of the opinion that this section needs revision and more effective means of communication developed and identified in the specific measures. In our view local councils such as East Lindsey must reach out creatively in an effective manner, for example by initiating and sustaining contact with Gypsies and Travellers on their own territory, such that their needs and views can be ascertained and feed into the plan process. One of the reasons why the planning system has failed this community in the past has been the almost total lack of direct contact over policy matters which directly affect them.

Test 6

Test 7

Test 8

Test 9

East Lindsey Local Development Framework Statement Of Community Involvement Log of Responses to Submission Document

General Comment FFT is a national charity concerned with issues relating to Gypsies and Travellers. I have recently been appointed as Planning Officer to work with councils regarding the implementation of the new Government Planning Circular 1/2006 which, if implemented properly and expeditiously, should go a long way to meeting the dire and urgent need for appropriate accommodation for this marginalized group. FFT is unable to respond in detail to all consultations received for resource reasons. We trust you will find this letter useful. Travellers' accommodation needs have been ignored for many years in many places and the situation has grown worse over the past 12 years since the repeal of the duty on local authorities to provide sites and following the issue of revised Government planning guidance in 1994. In the context of national and local housing needs and projected development this is a very small isse indeed which should be easy to solve given the necessary goodwill and determination by local authorities to meet accommodation need. The Government has now revised a planning circular (1/2006) and a guidance into carrying out Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessments (GTAAs) (ODPM Feb 2006). The assessment of Gypsy and Traveller accommodation needs is a statutory requirement under s.225 of the Housing Act 2004. We would commend the recently published Cambridge Sub-Region Traveller needs assessment carried out by Professor Robert Home and Dr Margaret Greenfields (see Cambridge County Council website) as a model of good practice and community involvement. They identified the five factors to be taken into consideration when assessing need as existing provision, demand arising from unauthorised development and unauthorised camping, allowance for overcrowding, new family formation and movement out of housing. For general guidance you may find it helpful to look at the website of the Gypsy and Traveller Law Reform Coalition which sets out advice on Gypsy and Traveller accommodation needs and the new planning system. The new circular was in response to the failure of a previous planning circular and a recognition that research has confirmed the link between the lack of good quality sites and poor health and education and employment opportunities for this group. It also states that priority setting is the responsibility of local authorities within the national framework provided by government. This framework includes the aim: 'to increase significantly the number of gypsy and traveller sites in appropriate locations with planning permission in order to address under-provision over the next 3-5 years'. It also indicates that transitional arrangements should be put into place in advance of the completion of GTAAs and that where there is pressing need local planning authorities should bring forward DPDs containing site allocations in advance of regional consideration of pitch numbers (p11-12 Circular 1/2006). I quote from that section: 'Where there is clear and immediate need….local planning authorities should bring forward DPDs containing site allocations in advance of regional consideration of pitch numbers , and the completion of the new GTAAs'. FFT feels that transitional arrangements should be put into place soon otherwise the scope for delay is considerable. FFT has also become concerned about the depth and quality of consultation by many local authorities during the development of planning policy. Whilst we are pleased to comment as far as we are able on developing local documentation we are of the opinion, as I am sure a Planning Inspector would agree, that consultation of national organisations over local issues is not sufficient. We feel that local authorities should take practical steps to engage

with local groups and the local Gypsy and Traveller community (see paras 27-29 Circular 1/2006). We are also concerned about the general lack of race equality impact assessments (REIA) in the planning process. The ODPM has made clear that race equality should be at the heart of the planning process if it is to provide quality services that meet the needs of all groups in the community. The report 'Common Ground: equality, good race relations and sites for gypsies and irish travellers' (CRE 2006) recommends that Gypsies and Travellers are referred to in statements of community involvement and says that local authorities should take practical steps to get them meaningfully involved, where possible building on existing relationships.

Wish to Appear at Examination **No** Wish to be notified of Outcome **Yes**

Date Received **08/11/06**

East Lindsey Local Development Framework Statement Of Community Involvement Log of Responses to Submission Document

Response Number **SCI 209**	On Behalf of:
Name Mr R S **Paul**	**Frithville & Westville Parish Council**

Test 1 Yes

Test 2 Yes

Test 3 Yes

Test 4 Yes

Test 5 Yes

Test 6 Yes

Test 7 Yes

Test 8 Yes

Test 9 Yes

General Comment

Wish to Appear at Examination **No** Wish to be notified of Outcome **Yes**

Date Received **15/11/06**

East Lindsey Local Development Framework Statement Of Community Involvement Log of Responses to Submission Document

Response Number **SCI 210**	On Behalf of:
Name Mrs C **Overton**	**Frithville & Westville Parish Council**

Test 1 Yes

Test 2 Yes

Test 3 Yes

Test 4 Yes

Test 5 Yes

Test 6 Yes

Test 7 Yes

Test 8 Yes

Test 9 Yes

General Comment

Wish to Appear at Examination **No** Wish to be notified of Outcome **No**

Date Received **15/11/06**

East Lindsey Local Development Framework Statement Of Community Involvement Log of Responses to Submission Document

Response Number **SCI 211**	On Behalf of:
Name Mr RAEJ **Hodges**	

Test 1

Test 2

Test 3

Test 4

Test 5

Test 6

Test 7

Test 8

Test 9 Definitely use for letter to neighbour(s) for small and large developments

General Comment

Wish to Appear at Examination **No** Wish to be notified of Outcome **Yes**

Date Received **15/11/06**

East Lindsey Local Development Framework Statement Of Community Involvement Log of Responses to Submission Document

Response Number **SCI 212**	On Behalf of:
Name Cllr C **Turner-Simpson**	**Bilsby & Farlesthorpe Parish Council**

Test 1 Test satisfied

Test 2 Test satisfied

Test 3 Test satisfied

Test 4 Test satisfied

Test 5 All notices should go in ALL local newspapers not the one with the lowest circulation. Postal consultations most important.

Test 6

Test 7 Test satisfied

Test 8 Test satisfied

Test 9 Test satisfied, I feel it is important that Councils remain in postal contact with ALL affected parties.

General Comment

Wish to Appear at Examination Wish to be notified of Outcome **Yes**

Date Received **08/11/06**

East Lindsey Local Development Framework Statement Of Community Involvement Log of Responses to Submission Document

Response Number **SCI 213**	On Behalf of:
Name Mr R **Bestwick**	**Lakeside Park**

Test 1 Yes

Test 2 Yes

Test 3 Yes

Test 4 Yes

Test 5 Yes

Test 6 Yes

Test 7 Yes

Test 8 Yes

Test 9 Yes

General Comment

Wish to Appear at Examination **No** Wish to be notified of Outcome **Yes**

Date Received **08/11/06**

East Lindsey Local Development Framework Statement Of Community Involvement Log of Responses to Submission Document

Response Number **SCI 214** On Behalf of:
Name Mr G **Pack**

Test 1

Test 2

Test 3

Test 4

Test 5

Test 6

Test 7

Test 8

Test 9

General Comment I am very suspicious of what is really behind the need for a Local Development Framework rather than the Local Plan system (I appreciate that it is central government and/or EU which has dictated this - not ELDC). In addition I am very sceptical of any planning system. Having said these things it would appear that the Councils SCI is acceptable to me in its present form.

Wish to Appear at Examination Wish to be notified of Outcome

Date Received **08/11/06**

East Lindsey Local Development Framework Statement Of Community Involvement Log of Responses to Submission Document

Response Number **SCI 215** Name Mr A **Cumberworth**	On Behalf of: **Mablethorpe & Sutton Town Council**

Test 1 yes

Test 2 Yes

Test 3 Yes

Test 4 Yes

Test 5 Yes

Test 6 No details of resources provided. Concern that by employing staff from other departments may not be fully trained. Who are the partners? Can you detail council resources?

Test 7 Yes

Test 8 Yes

Test 9 Yes

General Comment

Wish to Appear at Examination **No** Wish to be notified of Outcome **Yes**

Date Received **15/11/06**

East Lindsey Local Development Framework Statement Of Community Involvement Log of Responses to Submission Document

Response Number **SCI 216**	On Behalf of:
Name Mr J **Wadcock**	**Antony Aspbury Associates**

Test 1 (Ticked)

Test 2 (Ticked)

Test 3 (Ticked)

Test 4 Our overall view is that the document is cohesive and well presented. If there is one general criticism (common to most SCIs we have reviewed so far), it is the length of the document that may limit its ability to inform Community Groups and encourage their reaction and participation. As Town Planning Professionals we are familiar with documentation of this nature, yet some groups may be discouraged from reading and responding to documents of this length. In responding to the document as a Planning Agent, it is essential that we are actively involved at the earliest stage of the process. We note from Chapter 3 that early engagement with organisations such as ours is the first stage of DPD consultation. It is important that the time allowed for this process allows sufficient time for Officers to properly consider alternatives put forward by planning consultants, particularly where this involves land-use proposals, before moving forward to the second stage - pre-submission consultation on preferred options. In this regard it may be appropriate to pre-advise relevant groups and agents and invite submissions concurrent to the Councils own progression of alternative options. Many organisations such as ourselves already send in preliminary promotional submissions to Local Planning Authorities in advance of a Development Plan Review, yet the timing of these submissions could be more effective to all parties if invited in an appropriate timeframe that co-ordinates into the LDF process at each relevant stage of each relevant DPD. The new Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 legislation requires Local Planning Authorities to set out timescales for the preparation of DPDs in their Local Development Schemes. The ability of local planning authorities to adhere to these timetables remains to be seen, yet it is essential that any changes to the LDS are actively publicised and transparent in order that essential deadlines for representations to the LDF process are not missed. Planning agents tend not only to represent the interests of prominent land owners and development interests within the District, yet can offer relevant experiences of first hand dealings with other local planning authorities in this new era of planning policy. Their positive input should be encouraged and it is to be hoped that the positive intentions in this SCI to engage with fellow planning professionals materialises through the LDF process.Finally we would be grateful if this practice could be added to the formal list of consultees appended to the SCI.

Test 5 Our overall view is that the document is cohesive and well presented. If there is one general criticism (common to most SCIs we have reviewed so far), it is the length of the document that may limit its ability to inform Community Groups and encourage their reaction and participation. As Town Planning Professionals we are familiar with documentation of this nature, yet some groups may be discouraged from reading and responding to documents of this length. In responding to the document as a Planning Agent, it is essential that we are actively involved at the earliest stage of the process. We note from Chapter 3 that early engagement with organisations such as ours is the first stage of DPD consultation. It is important that the time allowed for this process allows sufficient time for Officers to properly consider alternatives put forward by planning consultants, particularly where this involves land-use proposals, before moving forward to the second stage - pre-submission consultation on preferred options. In this regard it may be appropriate to pre-advise relevant groups and agents and invite submissions concurrent to the Councils own progression of alternative options. Many organisations such as ourselves already send in preliminary promotional submissions to Local Planning Authorities in advance of a Development Plan Review, yet the timing of these submissions could be more effective to all parties if invited in an appropriate timeframe that co-ordinates into the LDF process at each relevant stage of each relevant DPD. The new Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 legislation requires Local Planning Authorities to set out timescales for the preparation of DPDs in their Local Development Schemes. The ability of local planning authorities to adhere to these timetables remains to be seen, yet it is essential that any changes to the LDS are actively publicised and transparent in order that essential deadlines for representations to the LDF process are not missed. Planning agents tend not only to represent the interests of prominent land owners and development interests within the District, yet can offer relevant experiences of first hand dealings with other local planning authorities in this new era of planning policy. Their positive input should be encouraged and it is to be hoped that the positive intentions in this SCI to engage with fellow planning professionals materialises through the LDF process.Finally we would be grateful if this practice could be added to the formal list of consultees appended to the SCI.

Test 6 Our overall view is that the document is cohesive and well presented. If there is one general criticism (common to most SCIs we have reviewed so far), it is the length of the document that may limit its ability to inform Community Groups and encourage their reaction and participation. As Town Planning Professionals we are familiar with documentation of this nature, yet some groups may be discouraged from reading and responding to documents of this length. In responding to the document as a Planning Agent, it is essential that we are actively involved at the earliest stage of the process. We note from Chapter 3 that early engagement with organisations such as ours is the first stage of DPD consultation. It is important that the time allowed for this process allows sufficient time for Officers to properly consider alternatives put forward by planning consultants, particularly where this involves land-use proposals,

before moving forward to the second stage - pre-submission consultation on preferred options. In this regard it may be appropriate to pre-advise relevant groups and agents and invite submissions concurrent to the Councils own progression of alternative options. Many organisations such as ourselves already send in preliminary promotional submissions to Local Planning Authorities in advance of a Development Plan Review, yet the timing of these submissions could be more effective to all parties if invited in an appropriate timeframe that co-ordinates into the LDF process at each relevant stage of each relevant DPD. The new Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 legislation requires Local Planning Authorities to set out timescales for the preparation of DPDs in their Local Development Schemes. The ability of local planning authorities to adhere to these timetables remains to be seen, yet it is essential that any changes to the LDS are actively publicised and transparent in order that essential deadlines for representations to the LDF process are not missed. Planning agents tend not only to represent the interests of prominent land owners and development interests within the District, yet can offer relevant experiences of first hand dealings with other local planning authorities in this new era of planning policy. Their positive input should be encouraged and it is to be hoped that the positive intentions in this SCI to engage with fellow planning professionals materialises through the LDF process.Finally we would be grateful if this practice could be added to the formal list of consultees appended to the SCI.

Test 7 (Ticked)

Test 8 (Ticked)

Test 9 (Ticked)

General Comment

Wish to Appear at Examination **No** Wish to be notified of Outcome **Yes**

Date Received **15/11/06**

East Lindsey Local Development Framework Statement Of Community Involvement Log of Responses to Submission Document

Response Number **SCI 217** Name Mrs S **Worthington Morrison Supermarkets Plc)**	On Behalf of: **Peacock & Smith (for Wm**

Test 1

Test 2

Test 3

Test 4

Test 5

Test 6

Test 7

Test 8

Test 9

General Comment Wm Morrison is a major food and grocery superstore retailer which, although currently unrepresented in the District is seeking such representation in the future. The Company would therefore like to be kept informed and consulted on further stages of preparation of documents which are to comprise the LDF, particularly with regard to any new retail allocations and/or new designated town/district/local centres in East Lindsey and any emerging SPDs. At this stage, the Company does not have any particular comment to make about the SCI, however it is keen to ensure that it is consulted at future stages of document preparation and we would advise that as both Peacock & Smith and the headquarters of Wm Morrison are located outside of the District, the most appropriate methods of consultation are by direct mailing, email and on-line. In that regard, please can you ensure that Peacock & Smith are included on behalf of Wm Morrison within the Councils consultation database.

Wish to Appear at Examination **No** Wish to be notified of Outcome **Yes**

Date Received **09/11/06**

East Lindsey Local Development Framework Statement Of Community Involvement Log of Responses to Submission Document

Response Number **SCI 218**	On Behalf of:
Name Mr A **Pritchard**	**East Midlands Regional Assembly**

Test 1

Test 2

Test 3

Test 4

Test 5

Test 6

Test 7

Test 8

Test 9

General Comment ..I have examined your SCI, which provides an excellent summary of the planning system and the associated procedures, requirements and issues. At this stage, I confirm that I have noted its contents and have no further comment to make. I look forward to further consultation as your authority progresses its development plan documents.

Wish to Appear at Examination Wish to be notified of Outcome

Date Received **07/11/06**

East Lindsey Local Development Framework Statement Of Community Involvement Log of Responses to Submission Document

Response Number **SCI 219**	On Behalf of:
Name Mrs A **Marshall**	**Langriville Parish Council**

Test 1 Satisfied

Test 2 Satisfied

Test 3 Satisfied

Test 4 Satisfied

Test 5 Satisfied

Test 6 Satisfied

Test 7 Satisfied

Test 8 Satisfied

Test 9 Satisfied

General Comment

Wish to Appear at Examination **No** Wish to be notified of Outcome **No**

Date Received **19/11/06**

East Lindsey Local Development Framework Statement Of Community Involvement Log of Responses to Submission Document

Response Number **SCI 220**	On Behalf of:
Name Mrs K **Roberts**	

Test 1 Satisfied

Test 2 Good

Test 3 Satisfied

Test 4 Satisfied

Test 5 Satisfied

Test 6 Satisfied

Test 7 Satisfied

Test 8 Satisfied

Test 9 Much clearer

General Comment These are my personal views not full council (NB. Mrs Roberts is parish clerk for Langriville)

Wish to Appear at Examination **No** Wish to be notified of Outcome **Yes**

Date Received **18/11/06**

East Lindsey Local Development Framework Statement Of Community Involvement Log of Responses to Submission Document

Response Number **SCI 221**	On Behalf of:
Name Rose **Freeman**	**The Theatres Trust**

Test 1

Test 2

Test 3

Test 4

Test 5

Test 6

Test 7

Test 8

Test 9

General Comment The Theatres Trust is an Advisory Non-Departmental Public Body and a statutory consultee charged with 'the better production of theatres'. The Town & County Planning (General Development Procedure) Order 1995, Article 10, para (v) requires that the Trust should be consulted before a planning authority grants planning permission for any development concerning land on which there is a theatre. Local authorities are required by Government Order to consult the Trust when considering planning applications affecting land on which there is a theatre. This applies to all theatre buildings, old or new, and regardless of whether or not they are still in use as theatres, on other uses, or disused. We are disappointed not to be included as a statutory consultee within your comprehensive list but appreciate that SCIs should be concise, and not overly prescriptive, and that you should not be producing a long list of names (as these would change too quickly) and are please that details of your consultation database are explained at 4.3. We look forward to being consulted on further LDF documents especially the Core Strategy stages and any associated relevant SPDs, Site Allocations, Development Control Policies and

Area Action Plans. NB. As has probably been pointed out, the line at the bottom of page 2 needs to be corrected.

Wish to Appear at Examination Wish to be notified of Outcome

Date Received **15/11/06**

East Lindsey Local Development Framework Statement Of Community Involvement Log of Responses to Submission Document

Response Number **SCI 222**	On Behalf of:
Name Mrs J **Thomas-Cousins**	**Lincolnshire County Council**

Test 1

Test 2

Test 3

Test 4

Test 5

Test 6

Test 7

Test 8

Test 9

General Comment A minor correction - Property have advised that reference to them as consultees on page 28, Appendix 1 should read - HBS Property on behalf of Lincolnshire County Council (HBS Property, Brayford Wharf North, Lincoln LN1 1YT) and not LCC Property Division.

Wish to Appear at Examination Wish to be notified of Outcome

Date Received **15/11/06**

East Lindsey Local Development Framework Statement Of Community Involvement Log of Responses to Submission Document

Response Number **SCI 223** Name Mr C **Russell**	On Behalf of: **Charles Russell LLP (for Broadgate Builders)**

Test 1

Test 2

Test 3

Test 4

Test 5

Test 6

Test 7

Test 8

Test 9

General Comment Please could you ensure that Broadgate Builders are included in the list of organisations where specific requests for consultation have been made in Appendix 1 - List of Consultees of the SCI.

Wish to Appear at Examination Wish to be notified of Outcome

Date Received **20/11/06**

East Lindsey Local Development Framework Statement Of Community Involvement Log of Responses to Submission Document

Response Number **SCI 224**	On Behalf of:
Name Mr D **Cooper**	**Saltfleetby Parish Council**

Test 1 Agreed. The simpler form of english and lack of acronyms is welcomed.

Test 2 Agreed

Test 3 Agreed. Support ELDCs view that the press is not sufficient

Test 4 Agreed. Timing is an issue for voluntary councillors in small parish councils who meet infrequently.

Test 5 Agreed

Test 6 We have to trust that management will fulfill its responsibility.

Test 7 Agreed. Action 16 is important.

Test 8 As for test 6

Test 9 Agreed

General Comment

Wish to Appear at Examination **No** Wish to be notified of Outcome **No**

Date Received **20/11/06**

East Lindsey Local Development Framework Statement Of Community Involvement Log of Responses to Submission Document

Response Number **SCI 225**	On Behalf of:
Name Mr D **Cooper**	**Theddlethorpe Parish Council**

Test 1 Agreed. The simpler form of english and lack of acronyms is welcomed.

Test 2 Agreed

Test 3 Agreed. Support ELDCs view that the press is not sufficient

Test 4 Agreed. Timing is an issue for voluntary councillors in small parish councils who meet infrequently

Test 5 Agreed

Test 6 We have to trust that management will fulfill its reponsibility

Test 7 Agreed. Action 16 is important

Test 8 As for test 6

Test 9 Agreed

General Comment

Wish to Appear at Examination **No** Wish to be notified of Outcome **No**

Date Received **20/11/06**

East Lindsey Local Development Framework Statement Of Community Involvement Log of Responses to Submission Document

Response Number **SCI 226**	On Behalf of:
Name Mrs B **Clark**	

Test 1

Test 2

Test 3

Test 4

Test 5

Test 6

Test 7

Test 8

Test 9

General Comment

Wish to Appear at Examination Wish to be notified of Outcome **Yes**

Date Received **20/11/06**

East Lindsey Local Development Framework Statement Of Community Involvement Log of Responses to Submission Document

Response Number **SCI 227**	On Behalf of:
Name Mrs J P **Bradley**	

Test 1 Yes

Test 2 Yes

Test 3 Yes

Test 4 Yes

Test 5 Yes

Test 6 Hopefully!

Test 7 Yes

Test 8 Yes

Test 9 Yes

General Comment

Wish to Appear at Examination **No** Wish to be notified of Outcome **Yes**

Date Received **20/11/06**

East Lindsey Local Development Framework Statement Of Community Involvement Log of Responses to Submission Document

Response Number **SCI 228** On Behalf of:
Name Miss P J **Evans**

Test 1 It is not clear from this document what are the minimum requirements. Perhaps this should have formed the Introduction in simple language.

Test 2 What is the difference between 'C.1. Links' and the 'Community Strategy'? It is not clear to a lay person.

Test 3 OK but omits most Holton Le Clay community groups despite the fact that HLC is one of the most populous villages in ELDCs area.

Test 4 In pursuit of your aim to be very 'inclusive' you could include publicity in public houses, local schools and check which newspapers are most widely read in the north of the district.

Test 5 You have omitted parent teacher associations & parochial church councils.

Test 6 ELDC implies that it is so

Test 7 OK

Test 8 It is very easy for a council to become 'self-satisfied' with its own mechanisms. Perhaps it needs a Community Representations Assessment Group?

Test 9 Yes. However 10 days is far too short a period for consultation for planning amendments. See p26 para 9.12 - especially if interested neighbours are on holiday.

General Comment

Wish to Appear at Examination **No** Wish to be notified of Outcome **Yes**

Date Received **20/11/06**

East Lindsey Local Development Framework Statement Of Community Involvement Log of Responses to Submission Document

Response Number **SCI 229**	On Behalf of:
Name Mr A **Hubbard**	**The National Trust**

Test 1

Test 2

Test 3

Test 4 The Trust's understanding of new section 4.3 is that all those people/organisations on the Council's database will be contacted at each stage of the production of each LDF document, on this basis the concerns raised by the National Trust at the draft stage have been addressed.

Test 5

Test 6

Test 7

Test 8

Test 9 Section 9.7 (first para) says that neighbour notification letters will not be sent in respect of open/vacant land; however, it is unclear what arrangements will be made in these cases as no other proposals are explicitly put forward. A specific suggestion in respect of the Trust's land interests was put forward at the draft SCI stage but has not been followed up.

General Comment Although not related directly to any of the 9 tests I was concerned by the wording of the new text at paragraph 2.2. This states that the Sustainability Appraisal 'ensures that the documents of the LDF balance the needs of society, the environment and the economy'. Advice in PPS1 (eg paras 4 and 13(I) is clear that rather than making trade offs between social/environmental/economic considerations that an integrated approach is taken so that 'development plans promote outcomes in which environmental, economic and social objectives are achieved together over time'. I consider that it would be sensible to amend para 2.2 accordingly.

Wish to Appear at Examination **No** Wish to be notified of Outcome **yes**

Date Received **20/11/06**

East Lindsey Local Development Framework Statement Of Community Involvement Log of Responses to Submission Document

Response Number **SCI 230**	On Behalf of:
Name Mrs J **Cooper**	**Maltby Le Marsh Parish Council**

Test 1

Test 2

Test 3

Test 4

Test 5

Test 6

Test 7

Test 8

Test 9

General Comment I refer to the above consultation document forwarded to the Maltby le Marsh Parish Council, which was discussed at its meeting held on 7th November 2006. Unfortunately the response form has been misplaced, however the parish council is supportive of the document and would wish to be kept informed of progress and consulted further as necessary.

Wish to Appear at Examination Wish to be notified of Outcome

Date Received **13/11/06**

East Lindsey Local Development Framework Statement Of Community Involvement Log of Responses to Submission Document

Response Number **SCI 231**	On Behalf of:
Name Mr R **Sargent**	**RPS Planning (for Merton College)**

Test 1

Test 2

Test 3 We note that there is a list in Appendix 1 of the Statement of Community Involvement that provides details of companies who have made a specific request for consultation. It is our contention that RPS Planning should have been included within this list, since we submitted representations to the First Deposit Local Plan in 2004 and have contacted the District Council on a number of occasions, both by phone and letter, to gain an update on the Local Development Framework progress. RPS Planning are currently acting for 16 clients in the District, and we will be making representations on their behalf to future Local Development Framework documents. By producing a list of those organisations, mostly of whom are planning consultants that operate in the local area and just beyond, it is likely that a number will be missed off the list. However, it is our consideration that given the involvement of RPS with the adopted East Lindsey Local Plan and its replacement document, that we should have been included on this register. If the Statement of Community Involvement is to contain a list of companies/bodies that would like to be contacted for consultation purposes, then this list needs to be exhaustive and safeguards put in place so that all bodies/interested parties who are likely to want to be consulted in the LDF process are notified.

Test 4

Test 5

Test 6

Test 7

Test 8

Test 9

General Comment

Wish to Appear at Examination **No**

Wish to be notified of Outcome **Yes**

Date Received **20/11/06**

East Lindsey Local Development Framework Statement Of Community Involvement Log of Responses to Submission Document

Response Number **SCI 232**	On Behalf of:
Name Mr R **Sargent**	**RPS Planning (for Capp Trust)**

Test 1

Test 2

Test 3 We note that there is a list in Appendix 1 of the Statement of Community Involvement that provides details of companies who have made a specific request for consultation. It is our contention that RPS Planning should have been included within this list, since we submitted representations to the First Deposit Local Plan in 2004 and have contacted the District Council on a number of occasions, both by phone and letter, to gain an update on the Local Development Framework progress. RPS Planning are currently acting for 16 clients in the District, and we will be making representations on their behalf to future Local Development Framework documents. By producing a list of those organisations, mostly of whom are planning consultants that operate in the local area and just beyond, it is likely that a number will be missed off the list. However, it is our consideration that given the involvement of RPS with the adopted East Lindsey Local Plan and its replacement document, that we should have been included on this register. If the Statement of Community Involvement is to contain a list of companies/bodies that would like to be contacted for consultation purposes, then this list needs to be exhaustive and safeguards put in place so that all bodies/interested parties who are likely to want to be consulted in the LDF process are notified.

Test 4

Test 5

Test 6

Test 7

Test 8

Test 9

General Comment

Wish to Appear at Examination **No**

Wish to be notified of Outcome **Yes**

Date Received **20/11/06**

East Lindsey Local Development Framework Statement Of Community Involvement Log of Responses to Submission Document

Response Number **SCI 233**	On Behalf of:
Name Mr R **Sargent**	**RPS Planning (for Mr Shucksmith)**

Test 1

Test 2

Test 3 We note that there is a list in Appendix 1 of the Statement of Community Involvement that provides details of companies who have made a specific request for consultation. It is our contention that RPS Planning should have been included within this list, since we submitted representations to the First Deposit Local Plan in 2004 and have contacted the District Council on a number of occasions, both by phone and letter, to gain an update on the Local Development Framework progress. RPS Planning are currently acting for 16 clients in the District, and we will be making representations on their behalf to future Local Development Framework documents. By producing a list of those organisations, mostly of whom are planning consultants that operate in the local area and just beyond, it is likely that a number will be missed off the list. However, it is our consideration that given the involvement of RPS with the adopted East Lindsey Local Plan and its replacement document, that we should have been included on this register. If the Statement of Community Involvement is to contain a list of companies/bodies that would like to be contacted for consultation purposes, then this list needs to be exhaustive and safeguards put in place so that all bodies/interested parties who are likely to want to be consulted in the LDF process are notified.

Test 4

Test 5

Test 6

Test 7

Test 8

Test 9

General Comment

Wish to Appear at Examination **No**

Wish to be notified of Outcome **Yes**

Date Received **20/11/06**

Response Number **SCI 234**	On Behalf of:
Name Mr R **Sargent**	**RPS Planning (for Mr M Wrisdale)**

Test 1

Test 2

Test 3 We note that there is a list in Appendix 1 of the Statement of Community Involvement that provides details of companies who have made a specific request for consultation. It is our contention that RPS Planning should have been included within this list, since we submitted representations to the First Deposit Local Plan in 2004 and have contacted the District Council on a number of occasions, both by phone and letter, to gain an update on the Local Development Framework progress. RPS Planning are currently acting for 16 clients in the District, and we will be making representations on their behalf to future Local Development Framework documents. By producing a list of those organisations, mostly of whom are planning consultants that operate in the local area and just beyond, it is likely that a number will be missed off the list. However, it is our consideration that given the involvement of RPS with the adopted East Lindsey Local Plan and its replacement document, that we should have been included on this register. If the Statement of Community Involvement is to contain a list of companies/bodies that would like to be contacted for consultation purposes, then this list needs to be exhaustive and safeguards put in place so that all bodies/interested parties who are likely to want to be consulted in the LDF process are notified.

Test 4

Test 5

Test 6

Test 7

Test 8

Test 9

General Comment

Wish to Appear at Examination **No**

Wish to be notified of Outcome **Yes**

Date Received **20/11/06**

Response Number **SCI 235**	On Behalf of:
Name Mr R **Sargent**	**RPS Planning (for Mr S B Roughton)**

Test 1

Test 2

Test 3 We note that there is a list in Appendix 1 of the Statement of Community Involvement that provides details of companies who have made a specific request for consultation. It is our contention that RPS Planning should have been included within this list, since we submitted representations to the First Deposit Local Plan in 2004 and have contacted the District Council on a number of occasions, both by phone and letter, to gain an update on the Local Development Framework progress. RPS Planning are currently acting for 16 clients in the District, and we will be making representations on their behalf to future Local Development Framework documents. By producing a list of those organisations, mostly of whom are planning consultants that operate in the local area and just beyond, it is likely that a number will be missed off the list. However, it is our consideration that given the involvement of RPS with the adopted East Lindsey Local Plan and its replacement document, that we should have been included on this register. If the Statement of Community Involvement is to contain a list of companies/bodies that would like to be contacted for consultation purposes, then this list needs to be exhaustive and safeguards put in place so that all bodies/interested parties who are likely to want to be consulted in the LDF process are notified.

Test 4

Test 5

Test 6

Test 7

Test 8

Test 9

General Comment

Wish to Appear at Examination **No**

Wish to be notified of Outcome **Yes**

Date Received **20/11/06**

East Lindsey Local Development Framework Statement Of Community Involvement Log of Responses to Submission Document

Response Number **SCI 236**	On Behalf of:
Name Mr R **Sargent**	**RPS Planning (for Maddison Family)**

Test 1

Test 2

Test 3 We note that there is a list in Appendix 1 of the Statement of Community Involvement that provides details of companies who have made a specific request for consultation. It is our contention that RPS Planning should have been included within this list, since we submitted representations to the First Deposit Local Plan in 2004 and have contacted the District Council on a number of occasions, both by phone and letter, to gain an update on the Local Development Framework progress. RPS Planning are currently acting for 16 clients in the District, and we will be making representations on their behalf to future Local Development Framework documents. By producing a list of those organisations, mostly of whom are planning consultants that operate in the local area and just beyond, it is likely that a number will be missed off the list. However, it is our consideration that given the involvement of RPS with the adopted East Lindsey Local Plan and its replacement document, that we should have been included on this register. If the Statement of Community Involvement is to contain a list of companies/bodies that would like to be contacted for consultation purposes, then this list needs to be exhaustive and safeguards put in place so that all bodies/interested parties who are likely to want to be consulted in the LDF process are notified.

Test 4

Test 5

Test 6

Test 7

Test 8

Test 9

General Comment

Wish to Appear at Examination **No**

Wish to be notified of Outcome **Yes**

Date Received **20/11/06**

Response Number **SCI 237**	On Behalf of:
Name Mr R **Sargent**	**RPS Planning (for Mr R Howell)**

Test 1

Test 2

Test 3 We note that there is a list in Appendix 1 of the Statement of Community Involvement that provides details of companies who have made a specific request for consultation. It is our contention that RPS Planning should have been included within this list, since we submitted representations to the First Deposit Local Plan in 2004 and have contacted the District Council on a number of occasions, both by phone and letter, to gain an update on the Local Development Framework progress. RPS Planning are currently acting for 16 clients in the District, and we will be making representations on their behalf to future Local Development Framework documents. By producing a list of those organisations, mostly of whom are planning consultants that operate in the local area and just beyond, it is likely that a number will be missed off the list. However, it is our consideration that given the involvement of RPS with the adopted East Lindsey Local Plan and its replacement document, that we should have been included on this register. If the Statement of Community Involvement is to contain a list of companies/bodies that would like to be contacted for consultation purposes, then this list needs to be exhaustive and safeguards put in place so that all bodies/interested parties who are likely to want to be consulted in the LDF process are notified.

Test 4

Test 5

Test 6

Test 7

Test 8

Test 9

General Comment

Wish to Appear at Examination **No**

Wish to be notified of Outcome **yes**

Date Received **20/11/06**

East Lindsey Local Development Framework Statement Of Community Involvement Log of Responses to Submission Document

Response Number **SCI 238**	On Behalf of:
Name Mr R **Sargent**	**RPS Planning (for AE Graves & Son)**

Test 1

Test 2

Test 3 We note that there is a list in Appendix 1 of the Statement of Community Involvement that provides details of companies who have made a specific request for consultation. It is our contention that RPS Planning should have been included within this list, since we submitted representations to the First Deposit Local Plan in 2004 and have contacted the District Council on a number of occasions, both by phone and letter, to gain an update on the Local Development Framework progress. RPS Planning are currently acting for 16 clients in the District, and we will be making representations on their behalf to future Local Development Framework documents. By producing a list of those organisations, mostly of whom are planning consultants that operate in the local area and just beyond, it is likely that a number will be missed off the list. However, it is our consideration that given the involvement of RPS with the adopted East Lindsey Local Plan and its replacement document, that we should have been included on this register. If the Statement of Community Involvement is to contain a list of companies/bodies that would like to be contacted for consultation purposes, then this list needs to be exhaustive and safeguards put in place so that all bodies/interested parties who are likely to want to be consulted in the LDF process are notified.

Test 4

Test 5

Test 6

Test 7

Test 8

Test 9

General Comment

Wish to Appear at Examination **No**

Wish to be notified of Outcome **yes**

Date Received **20/11/06**

East Lindsey Local Development Framework Statement Of Community Involvement Log of Responses to Submission Document

Response Number **SCI 239**	On Behalf of:
Name Mr R **Sargent**	**RPS Planning (for L G Dawson)**

Test 1

Test 2

Test 3 We note that there is a list in Appendix 1 of the Statement of Community Involvement that provides details of companies who have made a specific request for consultation. It is our contention that RPS Planning should have been included within this list, since we submitted representations to the First Deposit Local Plan in 2004 and have contacted the District Council on a number of occasions, both by phone and letter, to gain an update on the Local Development Framework progress. RPS Planning are currently acting for 16 clients in the District, and we will be making representations on their behalf to future Local Development Framework documents. By producing a list of those organisations, mostly of whom are planning consultants that operate in the local area and just beyond, it is likely that a number will be missed off the list. However, it is our consideration that given the involvement of RPS with the adopted East Lindsey Local Plan and its replacement document, that we should have been included on this register. If the Statement of Community Involvement is to contain a list of companies/bodies that would like to be contacted for consultation purposes, then this list needs to be exhaustive and safeguards put in place so that all bodies/interested parties who are likely to want to be consulted in the LDF process are notified.

Test 4

Test 5

Test 6

Test 7

Test 8

Test 9

General Comment

Wish to Appear at Examination **No**

Wish to be notified of Outcome **yes**

Date Received **20/11/06**

Response Number **SCI 240**	On Behalf of:
Name Mr R **Sargent Settlement Trustees)**	**RPS Planning (for AJ Clark**

Test 1

Test 2

Test 3 We note that there is a list in Appendix 1 of the Statement of Community Involvement that provides details of companies who have made a specific request for consultation. It is our contention that RPS Planning should have been included within this list, since we submitted representations to the First Deposit Local Plan in 2004 and have contacted the District Council on a number of occasions, both by phone and letter, to gain an update on the Local Development Framework progress. RPS Planning are currently acting for 16 clients in the District, and we will be making representations on their behalf to future Local Development Framework documents. By producing a list of those organisations, mostly of whom are planning consultants that operate in the local area and just beyond, it is likely that a number will be missed off the list. However, it is our consideration that given the involvement of RPS with the adopted East Lindsey Local Plan and its replacement document, that we should have been included on this register. If the Statement of Community Involvement is to contain a list of companies/bodies that would like to be contacted for consultation purposes, then this list needs to be exhaustive and safeguards put in place so that all bodies/interested parties who are likely to want to be consulted in the LDF process are notified.

Test 4

Test 5

Test 6

Test 7

Test 8

Test 9

General Comment

Wish to Appear at Examination **No**

Wish to be notified of Outcome **yes**

Date Received **20/11/06**

East Lindsey Local Development Framework Statement Of Community Involvement Log of Responses to Submission Document

Response Number **SCI 241**	On Behalf of:
Name Mr R **Sargent**	**RPS Planning (for Mr R Cauldwell)**

Test 1

Test 2

Test 3 We note that there is a list in Appendix 1 of the Statement of Community Involvement that provides details of companies who have made a specific request for consultation. It is our contention that RPS Planning should have been included within this list, since we submitted representations to the First Deposit Local Plan in 2004 and have contacted the District Council on a number of occasions, both by phone and letter, to gain an update on the Local Development Framework progress. RPS Planning are currently acting for 16 clients in the District, and we will be making representations on their behalf to future Local Development Framework documents. By producing a list of those organisations, mostly of whom are planning consultants that operate in the local area and just beyond, it is likely that a number will be missed off the list. However, it is our consideration that given the involvement of RPS with the adopted East Lindsey Local Plan and its replacement document, that we should have been included on this register. If the Statement of Community Involvement is to contain a list of companies/bodies that would like to be contacted for consultation purposes, then this list needs to be exhaustive and safeguards put in place so that all bodies/interested parties who are likely to want to be consulted in the LDF process are notified.

Test 4

Test 5

Test 6

Test 7

Test 8

Test 9

General Comment

Wish to Appear at Examination **No**

Wish to be notified of Outcome **yes**

Date Received **20/11/06**

East Lindsey Local Development Framework Statement Of Community Involvement Log of Responses to Submission Document

Response Number **SCI 242**	On Behalf of:
Name Mr R **Sargent**	**RPS Planning (for Mr & Mrs Wesley)**

Test 1

Test 2

Test 3 We note that there is a list in Appendix 1 of the Statement of Community Involvement that provides details of companies who have made a specific request for consultation. It is our contention that RPS Planning should have been included within this list, since we submitted representations to the First Deposit Local Plan in 2004 and have contacted the District Council on a number of occasions, both by phone and letter, to gain an update on the Local Development Framework progress. RPS Planning are currently acting for 16 clients in the District, and we will be making representations on their behalf to future Local Development Framework documents. By producing a list of those organisations, mostly of whom are planning consultants that operate in the local area and just beyond, it is likely that a number will be missed off the list. However, it is our consideration that given the involvement of RPS with the adopted East Lindsey Local Plan and its replacement document, that we should have been included on this register. If the Statement of Community Involvement is to contain a list of companies/bodies that would like to be contacted for consultation purposes, then this list needs to be exhaustive and safeguards put in place so that all bodies/interested parties who are likely to want to be consulted in the LDF process are notified.

Test 4

Test 5

Test 6

Test 7

Test 8

Test 9

General Comment

Wish to Appear at Examination **No**

Wish to be notified of Outcome **yes**

Date Received **20/11/06**

Response Number **SCI 243**	On Behalf of:
Name Mr R **Sargent**	**RPS Planning (for Mr Norburn)**

Test 1

Test 2

Test 3 We note that there is a list in Appendix 1 of the Statement of Community Involvement that provides details of companies who have made a specific request for consultation. It is our contention that RPS Planning should have been included within this list, since we submitted representations to the First Deposit Local Plan in 2004 and have contacted the District Council on a number of occasions, both by phone and letter, to gain an update on the Local Development Framework progress. RPS Planning are currently acting for 16 clients in the District, and we will be making representations on their behalf to future Local Development Framework documents. By producing a list of those organisations, mostly of whom are planning consultants that operate in the local area and just beyond, it is likely that a number will be missed off the list. However, it is our consideration that given the involvement of RPS with the adopted East Lindsey Local Plan and its replacement document, that we should have been included on this register. If the Statement of Community Involvement is to contain a list of companies/bodies that would like to be contacted for consultation purposes, then this list needs to be exhaustive and safeguards put in place so that all bodies/interested parties who are likely to want to be consulted in the LDF process are notified.

Test 4

Test 5

Test 6

Test 7

Test 8

Test 9

General Comment

Wish to Appear at Examination **No**

Wish to be notified of Outcome **yes**

Date Received **20/11/06**

Response Number **SCI 244**	On Behalf of:
Name Mr R **Sargent**	**RPS Planning (for The Holton Partnership)**

Test 1

Test 2

Test 3 We note that there is a list in Appendix 1 of the Statement of Community Involvement that provides details of companies who have made a specific request for consultation. It is our contention that RPS Planning should have been included within this list, since we submitted representations to the First Deposit Local Plan in 2004 and have contacted the District Council on a number of occasions, both by phone and letter, to gain an update on the Local Development Framework progress. RPS Planning are currently acting for 16 clients in the District, and we will be making representations on their behalf to future Local Development Framework documents. By producing a list of those organisations, mostly of whom are planning consultants that operate in the local area and just beyond, it is likely that a number will be missed off the list. However, it is our consideration that given the involvement of RPS with the adopted East Lindsey Local Plan and its replacement document, that we should have been included on this register. If the Statement of Community Involvement is to contain a list of companies/bodies that would like to be contacted for consultation purposes, then this list needs to be exhaustive and safeguards put in place so that all bodies/interested parties who are likely to want to be consulted in the LDF process are notified.

Test 4

Test 5

Test 6

Test 7

Test 8

Test 9

General Comment

Wish to Appear at Examination **No**

Wish to be notified of Outcome **yes**

Date Received **20/11/06**

East Lindsey Local Development Framework Statement Of Community Involvement Log of Responses to Submission Document

Response Number **SCI 245**	On Behalf of:
Name Mr R **Sargent**	**RPS Planning (for Mr J Greetham)**

Test 1

Test 2

Test 3 We note that there is a list in Appendix 1 of the Statement of Community Involvement that provides details of companies who have made a specific request for consultation. It is our contention that RPS Planning should have been included within this list, since we submitted representations to the First Deposit Local Plan in 2004 and have contacted the District Council on a number of occasions, both by phone and letter, to gain an update on the Local Development Framework progress. RPS Planning are currently acting for 16 clients in the District, and we will be making representations on their behalf to future Local Development Framework documents. By producing a list of those organisations, mostly of whom are planning consultants that operate in the local area and just beyond, it is likely that a number will be missed off the list. However, it is our consideration that given the involvement of RPS with the adopted East Lindsey Local Plan and its replacement document, that we should have been included on this register. If the Statement of Community Involvement is to contain a list of companies/bodies that would like to be contacted for consultation purposes, then this list needs to be exhaustive and safeguards put in place so that all bodies/interested parties who are likely to want to be consulted in the LDF process are notified.

Test 4

Test 5

Test 6

Test 7

Test 8

Test 9

General Comment

Wish to Appear at Examination **No**

Wish to be notified of Outcome **yes**

Date Received **20/11/06**

East Lindsey Local Development Framework Statement Of Community Involvement Log of Responses to Submission Document

Response Number **SCI 246**	On Behalf of:
Name Mr R **Sargent**	**RPS Planning (for Mrs B Fiddling)**

Test 1

Test 2

Test 3 We note that there is a list in Appendix 1 of the Statement of Community Involvement that provides details of companies who have made a specific request for consultation. It is our contention that RPS Planning should have been included within this list, since we submitted representations to the First Deposit Local Plan in 2004 and have contacted the District Council on a number of occasions, both by phone and letter, to gain an update on the Local Development Framework progress. RPS Planning are currently acting for 16 clients in the District, and we will be making representations on their behalf to future Local Development Framework documents. By producing a list of those organisations, mostly of whom are planning consultants that operate in the local area and just beyond, it is likely that a number will be missed off the list. However, it is our consideration that given the involvement of RPS with the adopted East Lindsey Local Plan and its replacement document, that we should have been included on this register. If the Statement of Community Involvement is to contain a list of companies/bodies that would like to be contacted for consultation purposes, then this list needs to be exhaustive and safeguards put in place so that all bodies/interested parties who are likely to want to be consulted in the LDF process are notified.

Test 4

Test 5

Test 6

Test 7

Test 8

Test 9

General Comment

Wish to Appear at Examination **No**

Wish to be notified of Outcome **yes**

Date Received **20/11/06**

East Lindsey Local Development Framework Statement Of Community Involvement Log of Responses to Submission Document

Response Number **SCI 247**	On Behalf of:
Name Mr Neil **Jones**	**Langriville Parish Council**

Test 1

Test 2

Test 3

Test 4

Test 5

Test 6

Test 7

Test 8

Test 9

General Comment Regeneration of old farm buildings for first time buyers. I would like an input to the new development plans.

Wish to Appear at Examination Wish to be notified of Outcome

Date Received **14/11/06**

Response Number **SCI 248**	On Behalf of:
Name Hanna **Mawson**	**Home Builders Federation**

Test 1

Test 2

Test 3

Test 4

Test 5

Test 6

Test 7

Test 8

Test 9

General Comment I would be grateful if you would ensure that the Home Builders Federation is listed with Appendix 1 List of Consultees and that the Federation is given the opportunity to comment on the LDF as it progresses.

Wish to Appear at Examination **No** Wish to be notified of Outcome **Yes**

Date Received **20/11/06**

East Lindsey Local Development Framework Statement Of Community Involvement Log of Responses to Submission Document

Response Number **SCI 249**	On Behalf of:
Name Mr R E **Black**	**Belchford & Fulletby Parish Council**

Test 1

Test 2

Test 3

Test 4

Test 5

Test 6

Test 7

Test 8

Test 9 We have concerns about the body of this section. 9.2 table H. We feel that neighbour consultation and site notices should be used in all cases. AONBs are not mentioned in this document 9.7 example. We feel neighbours should be notified even if a small section of open land separates them from the proposed development.

General Comment

Wish to Appear at Examination **No** Wish to be notified of Outcome **Yes**

Date Received **20/11/06**

Response Number **SCI 250**	On Behalf of:
Name Mr N H **Dawes**	**Brown & Co (On behalf of John Moody)**

Test 1 Yes

Test 2 Yes

Test 3

Test 4 No. It is more important than ever that deliverability is achieved. With changed housing numbers and with completion rates that will need to be achieved combined with the length of time that planning applications come forward it is absolutely vital that developer and land owner interest for housing and employment sites are fully involved at the earliest opportunity. Issues of deliverability, speed of deliverability and phasing are all matters that will need to be given great consideration. This can only happen if the land providers (developers and landowners) have early consistent and involved consultation throughout the process.

Test 5 Yes

Test 6 Yes

Test 7 Yes

Test 8 Yes

Test 9 Yes

General Comment

Wish to Appear at Examination Wish to be notified of Outcome **Yes**

Date Received **20/11/06**

East Lindsey Local Development Framework Statement Of Community Involvement Log of Responses to Submission Document

Response Number **SCI 251**	On Behalf of:
Name Mr G **Foster**	**Government Office for the East Midlands**

Test 1

Test 2

Test 3

Test 4

Test 5

Test 6

Test 7

Test 8

Test 9

General Comment Thank you for your letter dated October 6th 2006 enclosing a copy of your Council's Submission Draft Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) and information submitted to the Secretary of State as required by Regulation 28 of the Town and County Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004. In overall terms it is considered that the Submission Draft SCI appears to be generally 'fit for purpose' in line with requirements and accompanying guidance as set out in Planning Policy Statement:12 'Local Development Frameworks' and 'Creating Local Development Frameworks'. The Submission Draft SCI appears to meet the nine tests as set out in PPS12, para 3.10 although ultimately it will be a matter for an independent inspector to assess the soundness of the SCI.

Wish to Appear at Examination Wish to be notified of Outcome

Date Received **17/11/06**

East Lindsey Local Development Framework Statement Of Community Involvement Log of Responses to Submission Document

Response Number **SCI 252**	On Behalf of:
Name Mrs J **Draycott**	

Test 1

Test 2

Test 3

Test 4

Test 5

Test 6

Test 7

Test 8

Test 9

General Comment Please note that the GP surgery listed as Dr T Watkins & Partners' has for some time now been called 'North Thoresby Practice'.

Wish to Appear at Examination Wish to be notified of Outcome

Date Received **15/11/06**

East Lindsey Local Development Framework Statement Of Community Involvement Log of Responses to Submission Document

Response Number **SCI 253**	On Behalf of:
Name Mrs M E **Dawson**	**Partney & Dalby Parish Council**

Test 1

Test 2

Test 3

Test 4

Test 5

Test 6

Test 7

Test 8

Test 9 Please advertise in the Lincolnshire Standard

General Comment

Wish to Appear at Examination **Yes** Wish to be notified of Outcome **Yes**

Date Received **20/11/06**

East Lindsey Local Development Framework Statement Of Community Involvement Log of Responses to Submission Document

Response Number **SCI 254**	On Behalf of:
Name Mrs A **Bushell**	**Hemingby Parish Council**

Test 1 The Act only appears to require ELDC to consult :- The regional planning body, each relevant authority (any part of whose area is in or adjoins the area of the local planning authority, the Highways Agency

Test 2 Chapter 6 addresses this by stating the importance of co-ordinating consultation exercises. It is difficult to determine what will actually be done.

Test 3 No. It simply lists ALL identifiable bodies, relevant or not, most are not.

Test 4 Para 4.3 Parish councils are in position 4 of 8 in the list of who will be involved? Parish & town councils should have a pivotal position in all development activities.

Test 5

Test 6 ELDC has nowhere near enough resources to consult more than an insignificant fraction of the individuals & bodies listed in the document.

Test 7 A greater emphasis should be placed on comments obtained during all stages of the consultation process.

Test 8 The objectives seem to be unattainable to monitor and review the effectiveness of the SCI at each stage in the preparation of different documents would require signficant resources.

Test 9 Yes, but it seems to regard parish councils as being unimportant in this process.(Letter attached to response form - 'As you will see the parish council has made comments on many of the tests, but are particularly concerned about the councils policy for consultation on planning applications (test 9). They feel that parish councils are ignored in this process and will only be consulted if they decide to object on the application. The parish council represents the whole of the affected community and should be consulted throughout the planning process; even if the council has no comments to make on a planning application they should still be invited to attend District Councils planning committee meetings and should be present at site visits, as common courtesy suggests

that a delegation from one elected body should advise another elected body of their intention to visits the other's area of responsibility. Parish councils are also omitted from the list of people/organisations informed of the decision of the planning committee, unless of course they have objected on the plans. I hope that the comments from Hemingby parish council will be taken into account when a decision is made.)

General Comment A parish councillor wishes to be present in the event of a public examination. The parish council wishes to be notified.

Wish to Appear at Examination **Yes** Wish to be notified of Outcome **Yes**

Date Received **21/11/06?**

East Lindsey Local Development Framework Statement Of Community Involvement Log of Responses to Submission Document

Response Number **SCI 255**	On Behalf of:
Name Mr G **Cooper**	**Wolds Business Initiative**

Test 1 Satisfied

Test 2 Satisfied

Test 3 Satisfied

Test 4 Satisfied

Test 5 Satisfied

Test 6 Failed. We remain unconvinced that the council have the resources.

Test 7 Not proven as yet. Examples??

Test 8 Unsure due to comments in '6' above.

Test 9 Satisfied

General Comment

Wish to Appear at Examination **No** Wish to be notified of Outcome **Yes**

Date Received **21/11/06?**

Response Number **SCI 256** On Behalf of:
Name Mrs C E **Hart & Mrs M A Cox**

Test 1

Test 2

Test 3

Test 4

Test 5

Test 6

Test 7

Test 8

Test 9

General Comment We refer to our telephone conversation on Thursday last regarding our land at Kirmond Road, Binbrook, and to our previous correspondence, and would like to thank you once again for writing to us to keep us up to speed with developments during the consultation period. We are writing to confirm that we would like you to accept this letter as our formal notification to you that would still wish you to continue to let us know at each stage of the development of the new document so that our land at Kirmond Road, Binbrook may hopefully be included in the proposed area for considered development for housing for the future. We should be most grateful if you would confirm in writing safe receipt of this letter and advise if we should be undertaking any further action at this time. Please may we leave this with you to advise us at this stage?

Wish to Appear at Examination Wish to be notified of Outcome

Date Received **21/11/06?**

East Lindsey Local Development Framework Statement Of Community Involvement Log of Responses to Submission Document

Response Number **SCI 257**	On Behalf of:
Name Mrs M **Spence**	**Orby Parish Council**

Test 1 Why only has the minimum requirement been adopted.

Test 2 Bureaucratic jargon - requires to be more specific and in plain english

Test 3 Acceptable but not inclusive

Test 4 Doesn't address participation of local community

Test 5 Parish councils should be involved in any applications within parish and adjoining parish boundaries, eg. neighbouring council applications

Test 6 Where from and what budget was allocated

Test 7 Designed to stop community involvement

Test 8 Mechanisms not identified

Test 9 SCI does not clearly define how parish councils observations are addressed.

General Comment

Wish to Appear at Examination **Yes** Wish to be notified of Outcome **Yes**

Date Received **17/11/06**

East Lindsey Local Development Framework Statement Of Community Involvement Log of Responses to Submission Document

Response Number **SCI 258** Name Mrs J M **Tinkler**	On Behalf of: **Scamblesby with Cawkwell Parish Council**

Test 1 Ticked

Test 2 Ticked

Test 3 Ticked

Test 4 Ticked

Test 5 Ticked

Test 6 Ticked

Test 7 Ticked

Test 8 Ticked

Test 9 Ticked

General Comment

Wish to Appear at Examination **No**

Wish to be notified of Outcome **No**

Date Received **21/11/06**

East Lindsey Local Development Framework Statement Of Community Involvement Log of Responses to Submission Document

Response Number **SCI 259**	On Behalf of:
Name Mr Ian **Smelt**	**Voluntary Action East Lindsey**

Test 1 yes

Test 2 Yes

Test 3 Yes

Test 4 Yes

Test 5 Yes

Test 6 With ongoing development within ELDC one has to hope that this will be the case at its conclusion

Test 7 Yes

Test 8 It has a strategy which states it will review but doesn't specify by whom this will be done

Test 9 Yes

General Comment

Wish to Appear at Examination **No** Wish to be notified of Outcome **Yes**

Date Received **18/10/06**

East Lindsey Local Development Framework Statement Of Community Involvement Log of Responses to Submission Document

Response Number **SCI 260**	On Behalf of:
Name Miss G **Kirkby**	**Beesby Residents Association**

Test 1 Yes

Test 2 Yes

Test 3 Yes

Test 4 Yes

Test 5 Yes

Test 6 Presume relates to ELDC resources

Test 7 Yes

Test 8 Yes

Test 9 Yes

General Comment

Wish to Appear at Examination **No** Wish to be notified of Outcome **Yes**

Date Received **22/11/06?**

East Lindsey Local Development Framework Statement Of Community Involvement Log of Responses to Submission Document

Response Number **SCI 261**	On Behalf of:
Name Mrs W **Radford**	**Woodhall Spa Parish Council**

Test 1 Yes

Test 2 Yes

Test 3 Yes

Test 4 Yes

Test 5 Table G - to show commitment ? Should be changed to tick in columns: Public & Comm. Group Meetings/Questionnaire/Opinion Polls & workshops & interactive events

Test 6 Yes

Test 7 Yes

Test 8 Yes

Test 9 Table H. The rows 'small developments' and 'large developments' should have an extra tick in 'neighbours column'. The elderly & infirm not necessarily visit site notices.

General Comment

Wish to Appear at Examination **No** Wish to be notified of Outcome **Yes**

Date Received **22/11/06?**