

## Summary of responses to the SCI consultation

Name and Date	Representation/Consultation Response	Council Comment	Action Recommended
Beeston and District Civic Society (May 2022)	The Society agrees with the statements at paragraphs 2.2 and 3.1 regarding Neighbourhood Planning.	Noted.	No action needed..
Beeston and District Civic Society (May 2022)	The Society would like there to be a 'Beeston and District Neighbourhood Forum and Plan'.	The establishment of a Forum and the production of a Plan are matters beyond the scope of the SCI itself. However the Council would be pleased to discuss these points with the Society.	No action needed.
Beeston and District Civic Society (May 2022)	The Society agrees with paragraph 2.8, regarding the Duty to Co-operate.	Noted.	No action needed.
Beeston and District Civic Society (May 2022)	The Society agrees with paragraph 2.11 regarding methods of involvement and shifting the focus towards digital platforms.	Noted.	No action needed.
Beeston and District Civic Society (May 2022)	Regarding paragraph 2.12, the Society agrees that the proposed methods of consultation 'can be successful'. However the Society 'should take an active role' in 'explaining the importance of such consultations' and 'facilitating presentations, exhibitions and workshops in the community'.	The Council would welcome the involvement of the Society and other community groups and would be pleased to discuss these points. No changes to the document are required.	No action needed.
Beeston and District Civic Society (May 2022)	Regarding paragraphs 2.13-2.14 on 'hard to reach groups', the Society 'would be	Noted and welcomed.	No action needed.

Name and Date	Representation/Consultation Response	Council Comment	Action Recommended
	willing to help the Council make better use of local organisations, groups and communities to reach out to the diverse community it serves’.		
Beeston and District Civic Society (May 2022)	Regarding paragraph 4.1, concerning community involvement in planning applications, the Society supports an ‘online first’ approach. It proposes that comments on applications should be available online. It considers that there should be ‘better functionality for the response form’ and that ‘it should also be possible to upload accompanying images, petitions or files’ and ‘link to online petitions’. There should be ‘clearer interface on planning applications’.	The Council agrees regarding the ‘online first’ approach, which is, broadly, what the revised SCI proposes. Having carefully considered the Society’s suggestion, the Council does not agree that comments on planning applications should be available online. However, copies of comments on applications will continue to be provided on request, by email or post. The Council will also continue to consider ways in which its online services can be improved. It would not be appropriate for the SCI to go into detail on these matters.	No action needed.
Beeston and District Civic Society (May 2022)	Regarding paragraph 4.4, the Society welcomes the encouragement of pre-application enquiries. However ‘applications which omit or lack prior consultation with neighbours and members	The Council will continue to encourage pre-application enquiries and to consider applications on their merits.	No action needed.

Name and Date	Representation/Consultation Response	Council Comment	Action Recommended
	of the public should be actively discouraged’.		
Beeston and District Civic Society (May 2022)	Regarding paragraph 4.8, concerning the publication of planning applications, the Society is generally supportive of the approach. However it considers that the table should refer to the County’s Historic Environment Record and a Local Heritage List.	The general support is welcomed. The Council considers that the table covers all the relevant types of development which may require differing kinds of publicity, and therefore disagrees with the proposed additional references.	No action needed.
Beeston and District Civic Society (May 2022)	Regarding paragraph 4.12, the Society confirms its view that comments on applications should be available on the website, as ‘it is not reasonable to limit/expect people to come to the offices in person to view planning comments’.	Having carefully considered the Society’s suggestion, the Council does not consider that this would be appropriate. However, copies of comments on planning applications will continue to be provided on request, by email or post.	No action needed.
Beeston and District Civic Society (May 2022)	The Society considers that the contents of paragraph 4.13, concerning neighbour notification, ‘should be made explicit on the comment submission form, with an opt-out tick box’.	This point will be considered when the comment submission form is next reviewed. It would not be appropriate for the SCI to go into this degree of detail.	No action needed.
Broxtowe Green Umbrella (BGU) (May 2022)	Regarding paragraph 2.6, concerning stakeholders, BGU would be happy to be	We will add BGU to the database. No change is	No action needed.

Name and Date	Representation/Consultation Response	Council Comment	Action Recommended
	added to the Council's database of stakeholders who will be consulted.	required to the SCI.	
Broxtowe Green Umbrella (BGU) (May 2022)	BGU considers that the consultation methods listed at paragraph 2.12 are all valid. The group 'believe that we could assist the Council in reaching larger numbers and more diverse communities through engagement events'.	The Council would welcome the involvement of the BGU and other community groups and would be pleased to discuss these points. No changes to the document are required.	No action needed.
Broxtowe Green Umbrella (BGU) (May 2022)	Regarding section 3, concerning Neighbourhood Planning, BGU notes that there is no Neighbourhood Plan for Beeston and district. It believes that 'we could help address this gap and ensure there is a voice within this area'.	The production of a Neighbourhood Plan is a matter beyond the scope of the SCI itself. However the Council would be pleased to discuss this point with the BGU.	No action needed.
Broxtowe BC planning officers (May-August 2022)	For purposes of clarification, various minor wording amendments have been proposed at paragraphs 4.6, 4.8 and 4.9.	Agreed.	These minor amendments have been made. (There are no changes of substance to the version of the SCI that was previously considered by the Jobs and Economy Committee.)
Coal Authority (May 2022)	The Authority has 'no specific comments'.	Noted.	No action needed.
Environment Agency (May 2022)	The Agency responded to the consultation but made no comments on the document.	Noted.	No action needed.
Historic England (HE) (May 2022)	HE suggests adding a link to a list of statutory consultees for planning policy	Disagree. In order to be of any substantial use, such a	No action needed.

Name and Date	Representation/Consultation Response	Council Comment	Action Recommended
	documents and otherwise has 'no further comments'.	list would have to be long and complex, as statutory requirements to consult vary considerably with the type of document and the stage in the production process.	
HS2 Ltd (May 2022)	HS2 Ltd 'welcomes the inclusion of paragraph 5.1' (which relates to Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects, such as HS2) and 'has no objection to this consultation'.	Noted.	No action needed.
Natural England (NE) (May 2022)	NE 'are supportive of the principle of meaningful and early engagement of the general community, community organisations and statutory bodies in local planning matters'. Otherwise, NE made no comments on the document.	Noted.	No action needed.
National Highways (NH) (May 2022)	NH has 'no further comments to make at this time'.	Noted.	No action needed.
NHS Nottingham and Nottinghamshire Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) (May 2022)	The CCG confirms that it wants to continue to be consulted on applications for more than 25 dwellings and to continue to receive the weekly lists of applications. The CCG makes no comments on the SCI itself.	Noted.	No action needed.