

## Appendix 1

### Representations received to the Consultation Draft Statement of Community Involvement, July 2021, and Officer Responses

Consultation on the draft Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) was held over a six-week period, between 13 July 2021 and 23 August 2021. The draft document, containing the consultation questions, is available at:

<https://modgov.cherwell.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CIId=115&MIId=3529&Ver=4>

36 responses were received. The following provides a summary of each representation received and officer responses, including an outline of any changes proposed to the SCI.

Comment ID name / organisation	Section of document / question no.	Comment summary	Cherwell District Council – officer response
SCI01 Network Rail	Whole document	<p>Network Rail is a statutory consultee for any planning applications within 10 metres of relevant railway land (as the Rail Infrastructure Managers for the railway, set out in Article 16 of the Development Management Procedure Order) and for any development likely to result in a material increase in the volume or a material change in the character of traffic using a level crossing over a railway (as the Rail Network Operators, set out in Schedule 4 (J) of the Development Management Procedure Order).</p> <p>Network Rail is also a statutory undertaker responsible for maintaining and operating the railway infrastructure and associated estate. It owns, operates and develops the main rail network. Network Rail aims to protect and enhance the railway infrastructure, therefore any proposed development which is in close proximity to the railway line or could potentially affect Network Rail's</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>

		specific land interests will need to be carefully considered.	
SCI02 Historic England	Whole document	Thank you for consulting Historic England on the above. We do not wish to make any substantive comment, though I note a reference to English Heritage in the neighbourhood planning section.	Noted.
SCI03 Mid-Cherwell Neighbourhood Plan Forum	Question 1	No.	Noted.
	Question 2	Yes. There are no provisions proposed for assisting “made” neighbourhood plans which require support from the Council to review their policies. Such reviews will shortly become a requirement as a result of the Local Plan 2031 process, and under the forthcoming Planning Bill.  We request that an additional section be added to the SCI setting out what support will be provided to NDP groups that are preparing for review.	Reviews are covered by the same duty to support as new plans.  Noted
	Question 3	Yes.	
	Question 4	No. Both methods of notification should be used, not one or the other. The resources required to post letters in addition to site notices will be significant, whereas the benefits will be.	Noted. Change has been made to retain Neighbour Notifications for non-strategic sites as defined within Table 7 of the updated SCI .
	Question 5	Yes.	Noted.
SCI04 Middle Aston Parish Meeting	Question 4	In general, Middle Aston Parish Meeting finds the proposals acceptable. However, we do not agree with the proposal contained in Question 4. Given the importance of neighbour awareness of planning applications, and the low cost involved in sending out letters, we wish to see a	Noted. Change has been made to retain Neighbour Notifications for non-strategic sites as defined within Table 7 of the updated SCI.

		continuation of current practice rather than the proposed change.	
SCI05 James Macnamara	Question 4	<p>I would be grateful if you could register my strong opposition to the proposal to discontinue neighbour notification letters. Reliance solely on site notices is open to abuse by removal or obscure positioning of those notices and, even if used correctly, is discriminatory towards the elderly and those with limited mobility. In addition, for all residents, the limited time allowed for objections to be lodged means that even a brief absence could lead to a notice being missed.</p> <p>I therefore believe it is essential that you retain notification by letter, without which consultation would be rendered ineffective.</p>	Noted. Change has been made to retain Neighbour Notifications for non-strategic sites as defined within Table 7 of the updated SCI.
SCI06 Lower Heyford Parish Council	Question 4	<p>Lower Heyford Parish Council strongly disagree with this proposal. It would be open to abuse by applicants, who could remove or obscure site notices. In addition, this proposal relies upon residents passing and noting the notice. It is also of concern that this proposal doesn't accommodate those residents who have limited or no mobility.</p> <p>CDC have a duty to communicate with residents on matters what affect them, planning being a significant matter for many, it must not be the victim of a reduction in communications. A letter through the door of those potentially affected by planning applications is the only way to maintain transparency and fairness in the planning process.</p>	Noted. Change has been made to retain Neighbour Notifications for non-strategic sites as defined within Table 7 of the updated SCI.

<p>SCI07 Liz Smith</p>	<p>Question 4</p>	<p>I am concerned that this proposal will make it unacceptably difficult to be aware of planning applications. The site notice could be taken down leaving neighbours unaware. Residents in rural communities will be expected to keep an eye open for notices, which is not easily spotted even when you are looking for them. People with mobility issues or health conditions that keep them inside would be completely excluded.</p> <p>This proposal represents a dereliction of duty to residents, especially during a time where developments are increasing. I therefore ask that you continue to send letters to nearby neighbours.</p>	<p>Noted. Change has been made to retain Neighbour Notifications for non-strategic sites as defined within Table 7 of the updated SCI.</p>
<p>SCI08 Dr HF Askew</p>	<p>Question 4</p>	<p>It is a function of the planning process to ensure that the impact of any proposal on a variety of issues is taken into account, and in particular any impact on neighbours is considered, preferably eliminated or at least mitigated.</p> <p>We strongly object to the reduction in notification of any planning application as it is likely to result in many potential objectors not knowing about an application until too late. Surely it is not too much to ask that applications be adequately publicised as now by notices AND direct mail.</p>	<p>Noted. Change has been made to retain Neighbour Notifications for non-strategic sites as defined within Table 7 of the updated SCI.</p>
<p>SCI09 Bloxham Parish Council</p>	<p>Question 1</p>	<p>Yes, given the speed of technological and cultural change, this requires the head of planning policy to review and evaluate the effectiveness of policy consultations after each round and consider what changes might be needed, so that it is as flexible as possible.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

	Question 2	Yes, advice on how to ensure that the whole system has teeth and is aligned with regard to conservation areas, Article IV directions and other local strategies such as biodiversity and transport.	Noted.
	Question 3	No, but some principles relating to what large scale impact might be would be helpful.	This is defined within the SCI.
	Question 4	No, site notices should continue to be displayed and householder letters continue to be sent.	Noted. Change has been made to retain Neighbour Notifications for non-strategic sites as defined within Table 7 of the updated SCI.
	Question 5	Yes, because they can contain last minute critical, substantive points that have come to light because of other comments made.	Noted. Proposed to retain the current approach to late representations.
SCI10 Oxfordshire Clinical Commissioning Group	Question 1	OCCG welcomes being included within the Duty to Cooperate, on page 9. From April 2022, OCCG will formally become an ICS (Integrated Care System) and we look forward to continuing to work with CDC in this new organisational form as well.	Noted.
	Question 2	OCCG and CDC hold regular meetings to discuss the planning taking place in the area. These meetings are extremely valuable to us in planning the impact on our primary care infrastructure. In addition, all planning applications are sent to the OCCG planning portal to enable OCCG to respond.	Noted.
	Question 3	Yes, this is a sensible approach.	Noted.

	Question 4	Yes.	Noted.
	Question 5	Yes. We welcome being able to submit or amend responses up to when an application is considered as we are unable to secure primary care infrastructure where we miss an application deadline.	Noted. Proposed to retain the current approach to late representations.
SCI11 John Karlake	Question 4	No, both letters and site notices should continue to be used.	Noted. Change has been made to retain Neighbour Notifications for non-strategic sites as defined within Table 7 of the updated SCI.
SCI12 Fringford Parish Council	Question 4	Fringford Parish Council objects to the proposal to use site notices rather than neighbour notification letters. Both letters and notices should continue to be used. The proposal would remove an important democratic step in enabling residents to be made aware of applications and would be open to abuse by applicants who could remove notices. The proposal would also be harmful to the policies of openness and transparency in conducting Council business on matters that may impact residents.	Noted. Change has been made to retain Neighbour Notifications for non-strategic sites as defined within Table 7 of the updated SCI.
SCI13 Sibford Gower Parish Council	Question 4	Letters to neighbours are an important part of the process as it provides opportunity for people to respond and there may be people who don't have knowledge of or access of the internet who would not necessarily find out about the application if they did not receive a letter. Site notices are not always put up in places close to the property in question so those who are affected may not see the notice. The Parish Council do not agree with the proposal to use site notices rather than neighbour notification letters.	Noted. Change has been made to retain Neighbour Notifications for non-strategic sites as defined within Table 7 of the updated SCI.

<p>SCI14 Thakeham Homes</p>	<p>Question 3</p> <p>Question 5</p>	<p>Agree that this term should remain undefined.</p> <p>Paragraph 34 of the National Planning Policy Guidance leaves acceptance of late comments to each local planning authority's discretion. However, setting this out within an adopted Council document would formalise this as an accepted approach through the planning process.</p> <p>Local planning authorities have a statutory obligation to determine major applications within 13 weeks; or 8 weeks for all other types of development (unless an application is subject to an EIA, in which case a 16-week limit applies).</p> <p>Statutory consultees must provide a response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Within the period of 21 days beginning with the day on which – (i) the documents on which the views of consultation are sought, or (ii) where there are several documents and they are sent on different days, on which the last of those documents is received. In the case of applications for public service infrastructure development made on or after 1 August 2021 the period is 18 days; or</li> <li>b) Such other period as may be agreed in writing between the consultees and consultant.</li> </ul> <p>Paragraphs 13, 14 and 16 of the National Planning Policy Guidance are referenced. National guidance expects pre-application discussions to ensure no delays during the application process and stipulates that consultation</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. This approach continues the existing way of working. The restriction of comments to email/letter e.g. removing the commenting function on the website is considered a proportionate approach. We recognise that it is not always possible for consultees to respond within the timeframes specified.</p>
---------------------------------	-------------------------------------	---	--

		<p>“must” take place within 21 days, and not to the detriment of determining applications within the statutory timeframes.</p> <p>The statutory determination period incorporates the 21-day consultation period and allows for confirmation that additional information has addressed any concerns within the statutory determination period.</p> <p>Alternative recommendation: We support and encourage public consultation throughout the planning process but believe the Council should be seeking improvements to publication and notification processes as a more appropriate means to encourage and ensure timely public engagement. We suggest the Council publishes a local validation checklist that requires all major applications to submit a Statement of Community Involvement in order to validate the application. Therefore, applicants must undertake some public consultation prior to submission in order to ensure the application is valid. This, alongside the statutory consultation period of 21 days would provide sufficient time for consultees to respond to applications.</p>	<p>We do not consider the inclusion of a validation checklist within the SCI appropriate as it will limit officer flexibility.</p>
<p>SCI15 Middleton Stoney Parish Council</p>	<p>Whole document</p>	<p>In general, we strong welcome the commitment to encourage community and stakeholder participation in the planning process but think the draft SCI falls short in several respects. The main improvements we would like to see are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A commitment to make the online register user friendly, especially in relation to large-scale applications. When new documents are published</li> </ul>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. Officers will consider this separately from the SCI.</p>

	<p>Question 1</p> <p>Question 2</p> <p>Question 3</p> <p>Question 4</p> <p>Question 5</p>	<p>they should be posted up front or highlighted. Summaries of the key elements of a new planning application proposal should be included in the notification email. The current practice of alerting Councils to a decision on an application but not what that decision is is infuriating.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A commitment to avoid consultation on Local Plans in holiday periods</li> <li>• A commitment to use both site notices and neighbour notifications when publicising planning applications.</li> <li>• A commitment to require rather than encourage developers to engage in pre-application consultation with local communities.</li> </ul> <p>A commitment to add extra time if commencing consultations during holiday times.</p> <p>Yes. Provision should be made to support “made” neighbourhood plans requiring review.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>No. Both methods should be used.</p> <p>Yes.</p>	<p>The timeframes for producing Local Plans can be fixed by Government or other key dates. Whilst these dates will try to be avoided it may not be possible. This is therefore not taken forward for inclusion within the SCI.</p> <p>Noted. Change has been made to retain Neighbour Notifications for non-strategic sites as defined within Table 7 of the updated SCI.</p> <p>We are unable to require developers to engage.</p> <p>The review of Neighbourhood Plans is covered by the same duty to assist as new Neighbourhood Plans.</p>
<p>SCI16 Wardington Parish Council</p>	<p>Question 4</p>	<p>We do not agree that the Council should stop notifying neighbours about planning applications as doing so could unfairly discriminate against those who do not get the opportunity to see the notice and such a system assumes</p>	<p>Noted. Change has been made to retain Neighbour Notifications for non-strategic sites as defined within Table 7 of the updated SCI.</p>

		that no one will remove the notice. Sending notifications by post appears to be the only guaranteed way of ensuring neighbours are aware of a planning application which may affect them.	
SCI17 Chesterton Parish Council	Question 4	Chesterton Parish Council are firmly opposed to the proposal to no longer notify householders by mail of nearby planning applications, relying instead on a single site notice. This is a retrograde step. Site notices can be removed, they are usually ignored by residents and not all residents are particularly mobile and some are housebound. It is problematic where site notices would be posted for some major developments e.g. Albion Land and Himley Village. Parish Councils do not receive planning applications by mail and have to rely on the planning portal and it is not easy to arrange Planning Committee meetings.	Noted. Change has been made to retain Neighbour Notifications for non-strategic sites as defined within Table 7 of the updated SCI.
SCI18 Caversfield Parish Council	Question 4	The Parish Council did not agree with the proposal to use site notices rather than neighbour notification letters. It was felt that neighbour notification letters were of significant benefit in the planning process.	Noted. Change has been made to retain Neighbour Notifications for non-strategic sites as defined within Table 7 of the updated SCI.
	Question 5	The Parish Council welcomes the approach of Planning Officers accepting representations on planning applications submitted after the formal consultation period has ended. It has enabled a good working relationship between Parish Councils and District Officers.	Noted.
SCI19 Chris Robins	Question 3	No. I appreciate the wish to provide flexibility but it does not give the Council flexibility to intervene in cases where a development is below what might of otherwise been a defined threshold. It also gives developers flexibility to	Noted. Limiting the threshold may mean that some smaller schemes with greater impacts would not be required to engage. Discretion is therefore

	<p>Question 4</p> <p>Question 5</p>	<p>wriggle out of the obligation to undertake local consultation in cases that would otherwise have been above the threshold.</p> <p>I would like to see a maximum above which local consultation is required, whilst leaving the Council the option of requiring consultation about smaller developments where justified by particular circumstances.</p> <p>I think it is desirable for there to be wider notification than just the immediate neighbours, from which point of view site notices are preferable. However, there should be some effort to address the danger that immediate neighbours might miss site notices. Would it be possible to send immediate neighbours a brief notice advising them of the existence of site notices?</p> <p>Yes. Whilst there is no obligation to consider late comments, they should be taken into account where it doesn't disrupt the application process.</p>	<p>considered important. This will be monitored and reviewed.</p> <p>Noted. The proposed changes mean that neighbour notifications will be retained for some schemes.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
<p>SCI20 Dr Christopher Abbott</p>	<p>Question 4</p>	<p>As a retired resident with mobility problems I would be very unhappy to see postal information withdrawn.</p>	<p>Noted. Change has been made to retain Neighbour Notifications for non-strategic sites as defined within Table 7 of the updated SCI. Other methods, such as publicity on the website will also be used.</p>
<p>SCI21 Councillor George Reynolds</p>	<p>Question 1</p>	<p>Make sure all parish and town councils are consulted. Many parish councils meet bi-monthly, usually in the first two weeks of the month.</p>	<p>Town and Parish Councils are consulted on local plan documents. Whilst flexibility on consultation deadlines is</p>

	Question 2	No.	accommodated where necessary, appropriate and practicable, there is a need to meet programme deadlines and to plan the use of resources. There can be unintended consequences in rescheduling consultation periods. It may not always be possible to be flexible with consultation periods (some of which are prescribed).
	Question 3	Agree. If pre-apps are confidential then it would be unlikely to be consulted on by parish councils.	
	Question 4	The majority of parish councils say to continue with letters. These are useful when some adjacent properties are in different streets. Any application affecting a neighbouring property should be notified. It is not unknown for site notices to disappear and unless it is very close to the site it may be overlooked.	Noted.
	Question 5	I agree with the principle however which consultation period must be made clear. Many consultees (OCC CDC) are usually quite late. A cut off may mean developers will wait until the last day residents and parish councils can respond, and full information may not be available. It should mean late responses will be ignored but is this legal? It will put parish councils, ward members and residents at a disadvantage.	Noted. Change has been made to retain Neighbour Notifications for non-strategic sites as defined within Table 7 of the updated SCI.  Late comments are open to all bodies, including Parish Councils. The changes formalise the current arrangements and enable discretion by the planning officers. The principal change is that web comments will no longer be accepted after the closing date.
SCI22 Natural England	Whole document	We are supportive of the principle of meaningful and early engagement of the community, community organisations and statutory bodies in local planning matters, both in terms of shaping policy and in determining planning applications.	Noted.

		We regret we are unable to comment in detail on individual Statements of Community Involvement.	
SCI23 Bucknell Parish Council	Question 4	We strongly object to the proposal that written notification of planning applications no longer be given to neighbours of the site. This is an essential part of the consultation process and there is a risk that neighbours will not have notice of applications that may affect them if reliance is placed solely on notices. Such notices can easily be missed, can be removed and can be rendered unreadable. The proposal is contrary to the principle of openness and is not justified by the climate emergency. We ask that the present system of notification of planning applications remains in place, namely notification to neighbours by letter and by site notice. We raise concern that consultation on such an important change is sought in August when many consultees are on holiday.	Noted. Change has been made to retain Neighbour Notifications for non-strategic sites as defined within Table 7 of the updated SCI.
SCI24 Banbury Town Council	Question 1  Question 4	The Town Council are content with the intended consultation processes on planning policy.  The Town Council express concern about the possible change on application neighbour notification to move to only using site notices. It is possible that residents will miss the opportunity to contribute due to failure to see notices particularly when an application site is in a different street.	Noted.  Noted. Change has been made to retain Neighbour Notifications for non-strategic sites as defined within Table 7 of the updated SCI.
SCI25 Deddington Parish Council	Question 1	Would like CDC and OCCG to review the developer contributions SPD to ensure it is fit for purpose and will deliver the funding required to expand primary care across Cherwell. OCCG are required to create a plan for the expansion of primary care with evidence to secure the	This sits outside of the Statement of Community Involvement- no changes required.

	Question 4	<p>necessary s106 contributions.</p> <p>Informing residents of planning applications should continue by both letter and notices. Reliance on notices alone is open to abuse with the potential for signs to be removed or obscured and would discriminate those who are housebound or those with limited mobility.</p>	<p>Noted. Change has been made to retain Neighbour Notifications for non-strategic sites as defined within Table 7 of the updated SCI.</p>
SCI26 Drayton Parish Council	<p>Question 1</p> <p>Question 4</p> <p>Question 5</p>	<p>Policy documents specific to our parish should be sent as a paper copy as well as publication on the website.</p> <p>The council does not agree that neighbour notifications should be discontinued. Site notices are not always near the site nor prominent and could be missed by residents.</p> <p>In principle the council agrees but there will be cases when late representations accepted by the LPA need to be responded to.</p>	<p>A paper copy will be available on request. No change required.</p> <p>Noted. Change has been made to retain Neighbour Notifications for non-strategic sites as defined within Table 7 of the updated SCI.</p> <p>Noted. The proposed changes to not prohibit this, but mean that responses will need to be made by email/letter, rather than through the website.</p>
SCI27 Launton Parish Council	<p>Question 4</p> <p>Question 5</p>	<p>The Parish Council did not agree with the proposal to use site notices rather than neighbour notification letters. Neighbour notification letters are of benefit to the planning process.</p> <p>The Parish Council welcomes the approach of Planning Officers accepting representations on planning applications submitted after the formal consultation period has ended. It has enabled a good working relationship between Parish Councils and District Officers.</p>	<p>Noted. Change has been made to retain Neighbour Notifications for non-strategic sites as defined within Table 7 of the updated SCI.</p> <p>Noted.</p>

		<p>The time frame for Parish Councils to ask a District Councillor to call in an application to be considered by the Planning Committee should have the same system. The current system is unworkable as by the time the Parish Council has had an opportunity to discuss the application it is often too late to have it 'called in'.</p>	<p>This is not within the scope of the SCI. However the comments have been noted and will be considered.</p>
<p>SCI28 Wendlebury Parish Council</p>	<p>Question 4</p>	<p>The proposal to cease notifying residents in the vicinity of planning applications by post and relying on one notification pinned up locally is a retrograde step. We strongly oppose any changes to the current system of notification of planning applications.</p>	<p>Noted. Change has been made to retain Neighbour Notifications for non-strategic sites as defined within Table 7 of the updated SCI.</p>
<p>SCI29 Fritwell Parish Council</p>	<p>Question 1</p>	<p>Planning documents can be long, complex and difficult for people to follow and properly understand the implications. CDC should increase its use of live or online presentations and workshops to engage residents, explain the issues and make the process easier to navigate and respond.</p> <p>Small parish councils only hold formal meetings every 2 months and it is often difficult for councillors to come to agreed positions or consult properly within the time allowed. Timescales for responses need to take account of the additional workload caused by lengthy consultations and avoid overload, particularly during the summer when some councillors and clerks are likely to be away.</p>	<p>A new corporate on-line consultation system is expected.</p> <p>Whilst flexibility on consultation deadlines is accommodated where necessary, appropriate and practicable, there is a need to meet programme deadlines and to plan the use of resources. There can be unintended consequences in rescheduling consultation periods. It may not always be possible to be flexible with consultation periods (some of which are prescribed).</p>
	<p>Question 2</p>	<p>There should be specific mention for officer assistance and support for reviewing Neighbouring Plans.</p>	<p>Reviews are covered by the same duty to assist as a 'new' plan.</p>

	Question 3	Yes. A relatively small development in a small village will have significant effects on the settlement.	Noted.
	Question 4	Site notices are often not noticed by residents, particularly those that drive out of the village every day to work. Site notices compete for space on telegraph poles, it is an unreliable method and people tend not to notice them. Notification distribution should be to all premises in the immediate area, not just those directly adjoining. These notifications could be hand delivered when the site notice is posted.	There is a need to meet plan deadlines. It may not always be possible to ensure that consultation periods (some of which are a prescribed 6-weeks in law) can achieve this aim.
	Question 5	Yes. It is often difficult for small parish councils to respond within 21 days, and almost impossible to do any resident consultation within this timescale.	Noted.
SCI30 Laura Beir	Question 4	No. Letters and site notices should continue to be used. Site notices are easily torn down or destroyed and reliance on them would be an easy way to allow people to sneak through unpopular planning applications. Those who could be affected by a proposal may never pass the site notice and not everyone is able to get out regularly. One cannot expect everyone to check online applications. Notification should be via both letters and site notices to ensure everyone can object where necessary and ensure their town/village remains a satisfactory place.	There is a need to meet plan deadlines. It may not always be possible to ensure that consultation periods (some of which are a prescribed 6-weeks in law) can achieve this aim.
SCI31 Bodicote Parish Council	Question 1	The means of consultation set out are comprehensive. We would appreciate advance notice of documents, so that we know to expect them, and for parish councils to be involved as a matter of course in all things that affect their parish and the wider area. We recommend the use of	Noted. We are trialling this approach with our Local Plan Review 'options' consultation.

		social media be considered more fully as a method of communicating with the public.	
	Question 2	The means of providing advice set out seem comprehensive.	Noted.
	Question 3	We are content that this term goes undefined but are concerned that developers of smaller developments could argue they are not large scale and therefore do not need to conduct pre-application community engagement. There are instances where relatively small developments would have a great impact. Such developments need community buy-in as much as large scale development. We would appreciate that pre-application engagement include liaison with parish councils as a matter of routine.	Noted.  Whilst we encourage applicants to engage with Parish Councils as a matter of course it is not proposed that we alter the current approach as this could cause unnecessary concern amongst local communities.
	Question 4	The Council should continue to do both. Site notices can be missed or removed, newspaper notices have a limited reach, and online publication of applications requires residents to consult the website regularly. There should ideally remain at least one method of communicating directly with adjacent households to be certain they have the chance to know of planning applications, although we take the point about climate impact seriously. We agree it is beneficial to erect site notices in order that any resident passing by can be alerted of the application.	Noted. Change has been made to retain Neighbour Notifications for non-strategic sites as defined within Table 7 of the updated SCI.  Noted.
	Question 5	Yes.	
SCI32 Cropreddy Parish	Question 1	The statement appears comprehensive and inclusive of all groups including those without internet access. We would	Noted- the Policy Team will review the request.

Council	Question 2	<p>be interested in how Parish Councils might increase their role in communicating Local Plan consultations.</p> <p>The Parish Council would be interested in further details on alternatives to Neighbourhood Plans as a way of communicating the parish's 'vision' for the area's future.</p>	Noted- The Policy Team will review this request.
	Question 3	Yes, but would like to see a rationale on what types of development and context would be considered for developer engagement at pre-application.	Noted- at present it is intended to retain flexibility.
	Question 4	No. Neighbour notification remains a key channel for communicating planning applications. Would like to see evidence on how often neighbour notifications are the sole sources of information of a planning application for affected residents.	Noted. Change has been made to retain Neighbour Notifications for non-strategic sites as defined within Table 7 of the updated SCI.
	Question 5	Yes, this seems reasonable and helpful, although timely responses should be encouraged whenever possible.	Noted.
SCI33 South Oxfordshire and Vale of White Horse District Councils	Whole document	We support the draft Statement of Community Involvement and have no other comments to make in response to this consultation.	Noted.
SCI34 Epwell Parish Council	Question 1	No.	Noted
	Question 2	No.	Noted
	Question 3	Yes.	Noted.

	Question 4	Yes. Would recommend parishes put notification letters on their village websites or at least a list of current planning applications.	Noted.
	Question 5	Yes. This has worked well over the years.	Noted.
SCI35 Environment Agency	Whole document	We have nothing to add except that there appears to be a spelling mistake on page 30 – The Environment Agenda – we are assuming should read The Environment Agency.	Noted. Change made.
SCI36* West Northamptonshire Council	Whole document	The Council has no detailed comments to make on the SCI however, reference to neighbouring authorities beyond the Oxfordshire border should be included in paragraph 3.5.	Noted. Change made to include authorities such as West Northamptonshire at 3.5.

\* Denotes late representation