

Statement of Community Involvement- Summary of responses and actions.				
Ref	Respondent/ Organisation	Response	Comments	Actions
SCI.1.	Charles Muriithi/ Environment Agency	The Environment Agency have provided generic comments on the consultation that include a copy of their external consultation list and guidance setting out what types of planning consultations they want to be consulted on.	Noted	
SCI.2.	Richard T Smith	Were you aware that section 3.3 and subsequent subsections 3.3.1, 3.3.2 and 3.3.3 are duplicated on page 17?		Remove 3x duplicate paragraphs 3.3.1 3.3.2 3.3.3
SCI.3.	Karina Singh	The sci document is detailed and comprehensive and discharges the obligations of the legislation. However it could be strengthened in 2 ways: By being more specific in annex A of the groups EEBC will proactively consult on the neighbourhood plans and large developments. At the moment this list is generic and not meaningful. Who are we actually consulting with when we say older and younger resident groups? Are we consulting with schools/ care homes/ age concern? It is not clear. By linking larger planning decisions and documents more clearly to the local and neighbourhood plans. For example the 29 unit development on station approach is currently consulting completely out of context of the local – presumably previously agreed local plans	There are currently no Neighbourhood Plans in Epsom & Ewell. The current and emerging Local Plan documents are available on our website. All decisions of the Planning Department are available to view on our website and each application is accessed against our Local Plan policies and the National Planning Policy Framework. These policies are referenced in every permission or refusal.	Appendix 1: Include brackets here after 'Older persons groups' of (age concern and local care homes). Paragraph 2.8.3. Add 'For example for young people it may be preferred to take the consultation to meeting places such as the sixth form or college.'
SCI.4.	Richard Carr/ Transport for London	Thank you for consulting Transport for London (TfL). We are pleased to note that TfL is included in the list of Duty to Co-operate Organisations in appendix 1. As a result I can confirm that we have no comments to make on the draft Statement of Community Involvement (SCI).	Noted	
SCI.5.	Karen Haizelden/ Archadia Architects and Planners	Agree with the draft SCI 2019. Paragraph 2.8.2 and 2.8.8 should also be considered applicable to section 3 as on line engagement as well as publicly available hard copies of some planning applications would be appropriate in the planning applications procedure. As specialist designers of housing for elderly and disabled people the Archadia Practice has a degree of expertise that can be utilized with regard to specific sites and general policies in the future. We would welcome being consulted and would be happy to offer feedback on specific policies and procedures with regard to this specialist housing.	Paragraph 3.3.2 states that all planning applications are placed on the Council's website for public view. We also provide a computer that is available for public access at the Town Hall where an Officer can assist the public in viewing the plans if required.	

SCI.6.	Paul Snoddy/ Royal Automobile Club	<p>I have a comment on paragraph 3.2.10 which states that the Council will determine what information submitted by applicants is on a confidential basis and they release if an FOI request is made.</p> <p>My concern is that the document does not go on to provide a definition of the EEBC's 'public interest' test or that you will not inform the applicant of your decision before the information is released.</p> <p>In future planning applications there are potential documents that the Royal Automobile Club may not want released to the general public as they may contain commercially sensitive information.</p> <p>This email is a marker to assist with any future 'confidential documents' discussions with the Head of Planning and individual planning officers on applications submitted by the Royal Automobile Club in connection with the Woodcote Park Estate, KT18 7EW.</p>		Waiting for Information Governance Officer comments – Amendments unlikely
SCI.7.	Julie Morris (Councillor College Ward)	<p>Is it really sufficient to advertise planning matters/applications on just the website and in the press? There's sometimes no local press at all. Should the council be using social media to do this as well and setting up a dedicated Twitter site (or similar) which people could follow. Second point is that neighbour notification should not be left to just one case officer. In College ward there have been problems with this on three applications in as many months. The better policy would be for the case officer to get neighbour notification addresses rubber stamped by a second case officer. Yes, it's a pain, but the council should be absolutely sure that the right people have been notified to avoid problems in the future and two heads are better than one. To be honest a lot of the document was incredibly wordy and could have been shortened if it's for public consumption.</p>	<p>The planning department does not have the capacity to advertise all planning applications on social media. Where there is obvious public interest in an application or agenda item then we would potentially advertise details of the meetings on the Council's Twitter/ Facebook or Linked In accounts. The E-Borough Insight also contains links to committee items and is regularly updated. Neighbour Notification- It would not be practical for two officers to check every neighbour notification list and we do not have the capacity. The decision on which properties 'may be affected by the proposed development' is made by the Case Officer. This is based on professional assessment of the proposal and its likely impacts on the area surrounding the site. The Development Management Procedure Order states what is necessary for Councils to fulfil their duty and should be adhered to.</p>	
SCI.8.	Mrs Jean Steer, MBE, Chairman, West Ewell & Ruxley Residents Association	<p>I have studied and noted the contents of the Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) on behalf of the Committee of the West Ewell & Ruxley Residents Association. I understand this document will be submitted to the Government in future as part of the Borough's Local Plan. I confirm the Committee's support for this document to go forward as outlined in the consultation being carried out by the Planning Department.</p>	Comments Noted	

SCI.9.	Ian Booker	<p>The draft documents I have read give a history of Epsom & Ewell together with a map locating the borough in relation to adjacent London boroughs. Two things strike me that are misleading to the casual reader. Firstly I would refer you to referendum that was conducted in Epsom & Ewell back in the 1960's which asked if the residents wanted the borough to be part of the then newly formed GLC or be a part of Surrey. The vote was to remain in Surrey as residents felt they would simply be absorbed into the large metropolitan GLC which would erode their independence as expressed in having an independent RA Council. The map suggests that E&E is part of London which it is not.</p> <p>Secondly it is crucial to record that E&E Council has always voted in an independent Council. Unique in this area and is a clear statement that Residents wish to manage their local affairs and not be subject to large political party doctrine. So where does this lead me? Well residents have fiercely protected their borough from becoming like Sutton (for instance) which is now dominated by high rise blocks of flats. Sutton is now becoming Croydon and residents here in Epsom & Ewell do not wish to follow suit. We expect indeed require the Planning Department to respect that wish and not simply sway to the wishes of central government planning. High rise buildings above the 16m local policy will incur the wrath of local residents.</p>	<p>Comments noted. There is no map within the SCI and these comments do not relate to this consultation. No action required.</p>	
SCI.10.	Councillor Nigel Collin	<p>The SCI is comprehensive and encompasses that which is required. I would like to see better publication of changes in planning policy as per the LPP May 2018 amendments which were not well known by residents.</p>	<p>In May 2018 the Council confirmed and published the document 'Making Efficient Use of Land- Optimising Housing Delivery'. This is publicised on our website and within the Committee minutes. This decision did not change or amend planning policy but explained the weight of the new National Planning Policy Framework versus the Council's existing local policies.</p>	
SCI.11.	Mr David Gulland (Cllr)	<p>Summarised as: - can we find other ways of letting people know to go and look at the website (train stations, bus stops, leafleting etc?) - can we automatically go further than the minimum 21 days? - suggested adding in role of the Manager in the process - asked a question about this Neighbourhood Planning - is it of interest in EEBC, should we go more to promote??</p>	<p>The Planning Legislation is clear in what form we are required to communicate. At present this is via a letter to adjoining land owners, and or a site notice (with very specific wording) and if necessary advertisement in the newspaper. In addition we are required to maintain a register of applications that can be viewed. Over and above this is the weekly list published on the website and also the planning register.</p> <p>It is difficult to ascertain what or where greater information could be disseminated and whether the cost would bring about benefit, assuming we had a budget for doing so. We would also have to consider this cost against the balance of amenity harm of further posters, site notices and what benefit that it may bring. It is not clear that placing adverts at hubs as you describe would necessarily bring further interest.</p> <p>The 21 days is a prescribed period set out by Planning Legislation. We, like many Council's do not treat the 21 days as a cut off. We as a Council continue to accept comments</p>	

			up to the date that we make a decision. Officers encourage responses even if the time is elapsed. We cannot state this so explicitly and have to keep to the regulation requirements and set a date of 21 days.	
SCI.12.	J Bennett	Absolutely awful..over 300 people objected to building on the green belt and the R.A ignored them, they run the local council not the government. Need to change the name from residents association to ignore association!	These comments do not relate to the SCI- No Action Required.	
SCI.13.	Jane Pemberton	3.2.1. I haven't seen any sign of any pre-application consultation on development plans such as that of the corner of West Street and Station Approach (13 storey building proposed). I spent time engaging with the Epsom 2040 consultation when all the feedback I heard was to keep Epsom an attractive market town. The proposed 13 storeys will be totally out of keeping with the 2040 vision as it will obviously mean that other equally overbearing structures will be built.	As stated in paragraph 3.2.9 the Council encourages developers and applicants to undertake a level of public consultation prior to submitting a planning application. This is advocated in paragraph 40 of the National Planning Policy Framework which also states that local planning authorities should 'encourage' take-up fo any pre-application advice and engagement with the local community. This can not be insisted upon and is not a statutory requirement.	
SCI.14.	Julia Giles/ Epsom & Ewell Phab	It is good to see the proposals to involve disabled people and young people in consultations. For disabled people it is important that consultations are in appropriate formats - for example, a spoken word version for the visually impaired, and that consultation premises are fully accessible - for example, with any displays at variable levels for those in a wheelchair.For young people, it is important to take the consultation to them where they meet, for example in sixth form departments and colleges. Also, having council representatives to explain the content of the consultation and ensuring young people understand the relevance to them.		Paragraph 2.7.3 Add ' <i>For example a spoken word version of a consultation document for the visually impaired can be produced and for public exhibitions we will ensure that the consultation premises are fully accessible</i> '. Paragraph 2.8.3. Add ' <i>For example for young people it may be preferred to take the consultation to meeting places such as the sixth form or college.</i> '

SCI.15.	Alan Byrne/ Historic England	<p>Thank you for your email of 2 September 2019 inviting comments on the above document.</p> <p>The consultation process detailed in the SCI should be adequate in meeting the requirements of the Local Development Regulations 2004. It will be important to ensure that stakeholder organisations with interests and responsibilities in the historic environment, at national and local levels, are fully involved throughout the consultation process. To this end, it is important to consult with both the Council's own conservation officer or team and local amenity societies. In terms of the general requirements of consultation in relation to the historic environment, I attach a Note on Consultation with the Heritage Sector and a list of national amenity bodies.</p>	Comments noted. No Action Required.	
SCI.16.	Kayley Smith/ Highways England	<p>Thank you for your email of 28 August 2019 inviting Highways England to comment on the above consultation and indicating that a response was required by 17 October 2019.</p> <p>Highways England has been appointed by the Secretary of State for Transport as strategic highway company under the provisions of the Infrastructure Act 2015 and is the highway authority, traffic authority and street authority for the strategic road network (SRN). The SRN is a critical national asset and, as such, Highways England works to ensure that it operates and is managed in the public interest, both in respect of current activities and needs, as well as in providing effective stewardship of its long-term operation and integrity. We will therefore be concerned with proposals that have the potential to impact the safe and efficient operation of the SRN.</p> <p>We note that the Draft Statement of Community Involvement 2019 states Highways England are a Duty to Co-operate Organisation and a Draft Statement of Community Involvement and therefore we must be consulted within the planning process.</p> <p>Having examined the Draft Statement of Community Involvement 2019, we are satisfied that its policies will not materially affect the safety, reliability and / or operation of the SRN (the tests set out in DfT C2/13 para's 9 & 10 and MHCLG NPPF para 109). Accordingly, Highways England does not offer any comments on the consultation at this time.</p>	Noted. No Action Required.	
SCI.17.	J and G Goddard	<p>We have no confidence in EEBC Consultation proposals: anyone researching the history of surveys which claim to be "consulting with the community" schemes in the Borough will appreciate why residents hold this view.</p>	Comments noted. We are committed to engaging with local people, organisations and businesses in meaningful consultations. We hope that clearly setting out our future methods of consultation with the community in this SCI review will ensure that residents are more satisfied in the future.	

SCI.18.	Natural England	<p>We are supportive of the principle of meaningful and early engagement of the general community, community organisations and statutory bodies in local planning matters, both in terms of shaping policy and participating in the process of determining planning applications.</p> <p>We regret we are unable to comment, in detail, on individual Statements of Community Involvement but information on the planning service we offer, including advice on how to consult us, can be found at: https://www.gov.uk/protected-species-and-sites-how-to-review-planning-proposals.</p>	Noted. No Action Required.	
SCI.19.	Nikki Rov	<p>I welcome Epsom & Ewell Borough Council's commitment to greater community involvement which I believe is long overdue. In section 3.1.3 it is stated that for significant planning applications EEBC encourages developers to consult with the public prior to application. In my recent experience I do not believe that this is currently taking place, and it was only following public outrage that the Developers consulted with residents. Can you confirm that in all future significant planning application where EEBC have pre-application meetings with developers there will also be consultation with the public affected by such applications? 3.2.10: Can you give me some examples of what might be deemed commercially sensitive? I checked the website for the evidence base, when will the evidence for infrastructure be available?</p>	<p>3.1.3 It is not possible to confirm that this will happen in all future 'significant' planning applications as it is not a statutory requirement. The National Policy Framework (paragraph 40) states that Local Planning Authorities cannot require that a developer engages with them before submitting a planning application but encourages it. As stated in the SCI (3.2.1), the Council will encourage consultation with the public but cannot insist on it. 3.2.10 This could be confidential information in relation to finances or landowners details. the Infrastructure Delivery Plan is on the website evidence base page but the link at the top is currently broken.</p>	
SCI.20.	Natalie Rogers	<p>As an RA led council the document describes the minimum when it comes to engagement and communication with residents. Other LA's are setting the standard by their starting position being about community engagement and communication enshrined in a charter to achieve this. The current document needs to include how EEBC will reach "hard to reach groups" in our community and give them the opportunity to express their views via non-standard consultation arrangements. I would also like to see different communications channels being identified rather than the traditional ones on here, again other LA's seem to be setting the standard, can I suggest that EEBC follows their lead on this?</p> <p>Neighbourhood plans and forums section 9-11- EEBC needs to consider in more detail how it will support communities to achieve this. Again other LA's have put considerable effort into describing this and what specific actions they will take to support residents who want to do this.</p>	<p>The Council is always keen to explore new ways of engaging and communicating with residents and businesses. As stated in the document (paragraph 2.8.1) we will use a range of consultation techniques and those listed are examples. The council's role is to provide advice and support to groups developing a plan. It is the neighbourhood forum's that is responsible for public consultation and engagement in its preparation of a plan up to submission of the final draft ('proposed submission'). If residents were keen to establish a Neighbourhood Forum and prepare a neighbourhood plan, the Council would undertake the steps required as set out in Figure 4 of the SCI.</p>	<p>The document sets out how we will engage with hard to reach groups in Paragraph 2.7.3. This can be strengthened by adding 'hard-to-reach' before groups in the last sentence and adding 'For example a spoken word version of a consultation document for the visually impaired can be produced and for public exhibitions we will ensure that the consultation premises are fully accessible'. Paragraph 2.8.3. Add 'For example for young people it may be preferred to take the consultation to meeting places such as the sixth form or college.'</p>
SCI.21.	John Pulford	<p>1.1.2 The Statement of Community relates to planning only (but it also refers to setting (Community Infrastructure Levy in 2.6)</p>	<p>The Community Infrastructure Levy is prepared alongside the Local Plan by the planning department as the Charging Authority.</p>	
		<p>1.2.6 Perhaps if E&E want to use this paragraph they should find another word for "Thematic" on page 8, 2.4.2 which I have never heard of and I imagine most residents have not either, which is contrary to the idea of the Para. (Minimal use of Jargon)</p>		<p>Suggest amendments to paragraph 2.4.2 to remove 'both thematic and site specific'.</p>

	<p>1.3.1 It states “The needs of the community will be taken into account”. “Planning officers will work closely with”. As we have heard already EEBC is hardly positive about this new legislation. Currently, they are trying to circumnavigate the Law by removing Policies that protect the community (height and massing of buildings). Much of this new legislation has been talked about for ten years and E&E should have been more positive about this Legislation. How do we ensure they comply with Legislation? There needs to be “Performance Indicators of how E&E perform in their duties.</p>	No amendments to the SCI generated by this comment	
	<p>2.2.1 We need to understand what the Development Plan comprises of. What I am thinking about is what happens if a Neighborhood Plan would clash with the Development Plan.</p>	The development plan comprises of the documents listed within this paragraph. These documents consist of planning policies This can not be detailed in this document but can be found on our website or within the Local Plan Programme that is reviewed regularly and available on our website. See NPPF para 28-30.	
	<p>2.2.2 Look how low Community Involvement sits in the Picture. It’s not visually given any level of importance</p>	No Action Required	
	<p>2.3.2. It would be a good idea if examples were given of key issues.</p>	This document focuses on Community Involvement. More details can be found on our Website	
	<p>2.3.3 The use of the LDS...Local Development Scheme. “Is this the same as Development Plan? This is the first time it has been used. It states “When the LDS is updated it will be published..... Are we involved in the update before issue?</p>	The Local Development Scheme or LDS is the timetable for the preparation of the Development Plan. This is updated by Officers.	
	<p>2.4 The Neighbourhood Plan is found under, Supplementary Planning Documents, Other Documents as per Figure 1. So it hardly is given the level of importance that it deserves.</p>	No Action required	
	<p>2.4.2 Use of word “Thematic” as mentioned in 1.2.6 I have no idea what it means</p>		Suggest amendments to paragraph 2.4.2 to remove 'both thematic and site specific'.
	<p>2.5.1 Can you include examples of the Neighbourhood Plans and Development Orders?</p>	We do not have any neighbourhood plans in this Borough. Guidance can be found at the link below: https://www.gov.uk/guidance/neighbourhood-planning--2	
	<p>2.5 Figure 4 shows the steps in the Preparation of a Neighbourhood Plan. Where it refers to Consult a statutory list of consultation bodies including adjoining local councils, statutory bodies and statutory undertakers and Voluntary organisations, will contact details be provided or are we left to find this ourselves. Is there a standard form for making contacts and introductions? Will there be a budget for this.</p>	Some of these are detailed in Appendix 1. This question is detailed in relation to the preparation of neighbourhood plans and not for this consultation. The Council does not fund the creation of neighbourhood Plans.	
	<p>2.6 Other Documents-Community Infrastructure Levy. I think this is included for information. Is the Neighbourhood forum involved in setting the CIL?</p>	CIL is set by the charging authority that is the Local Authority and is subject to Examination in Public as set out in Figure 5.	
	<p>2.8 How will the Neighbourhood Forum be consulted in plan making?- I am just making sure I understand, although the Neighbourhood Forum will have been established with a defined perimeter (area), the Council will still involve the Neighbourhood Forum in other matters inside that perimeter and outside of the same.</p>	If a Neighbourhood Forum was to be established they would be consulted in the same way as other local consultees on plan- making.	

	2.8.3 Manned Exhibitions will be held on significant consultations... What is significant.....After the “words Local Plan” is the words “where suitable” What does that mean The same questions arise in the next para regarding smaller exhibitions and later in the para “These may be unmanned” It’s all very unspecific and leads to a lot of misinterpretation	Flexibility is required so as to enable the Authority to undertake consultations that include manned exhibitions which would be over and above the regulatory requirements.	
	2.8.7 Public notices will be published in Local newspapers “when appropriate” and press releases and/or briefings to convey information to wider audiences will be used “where appropriate”. If a notice is Public I would think it should always be shown in local newspapers not just when appropriate.	When appropriate is referring to the different stages in the preparation of the Local Plan where a notice is required by the regulations.	
	2.8.8 Making consultation material available. I would have thought that all data would have been made available electronically. People can’t keep jumping into their cars and going to the Council offices. Please explain	All data will be made available electronically. As stated, this will be 'as well as' publishing the documents online because some people still prefer to view a hard copy at the town hall.	
	3.2.1 Applicants or developers are” encouraged” to consult with the local community”. Should this be “required”? Otherwise there appears no point in the Neighbourhood Plan.	This is advocated in paragraph 40 of the National Planning Policy Framework which also states that local planning authorities should 'encourage' take-up of any pre-application advice and engagement with the local community. This can not be insisted upon and is not a statutory requirement.	
	3.2.2 The council welcomes and encourages discussions with applicants. Should this not be “required”. Should it not also say “between the applicants and the community or more specifically the Neighbourhood Forum”	This is advocated in paragraph 40 of the National Planning Policy Framework which also states that local planning authorities should 'encourage' take-up of any pre-application advice and engagement with the local community. This cannot be insisted upon and is not a statutory requirement.	
	3.2.9 The council additionally encourages developers and applicants to undertake a level of consultation again shouldn’t this be “required”. I recognize that councils will not look kindly on developers who do not consult with Neighbourhoods, but they did not do it for Stoneleigh even though the idea of Neighbourhood Planning had been talked about for ten years.	As stated in paragraph 3.2.9 the Council encourages developers and applicants to undertake a level of public consultation prior to submitting a planning application. This is advocated in paragraph 40 of the National Planning Policy Framework which also states that local planning authorities should 'encourage' take-up of any pre-application advice and engagement with the local community. This cannot be insisted upon and is not a statutory requirement.	
	3.3 What happens when a planning application is received? This section has been duplicated lower down on the page		Noted- delete duplication

SCI.22.	Shannon Cramer	<p>2.3 LOCAL PLAN Generally.... it is unrealistic to expect hard pressed Council Tax Payers (your employers) to be constantly engaged with EEBC via the EEBC website. It is also unrealistic to expect Council Tax Payers (your Employers) to read Insight Magazine from cover to cover unless they are told that there are important surveys inside which require their input because the surveys will later be used to form Council Policy. IF it is unrealistic to expect the Council to write to residents on a one-to-one basis to garner opinion (personally I think this is the preferred route), then important periods of participation should be timetabled to coincide with times when the Council DOES engage with residents on a one to one basis - ie when EEBC sends out Council Tax bills.....the Council certainly seems to know our names and addresses for THAT exercise. Could a note not be added to a Council Tax bill telling residents that you need their opinion on, say, guiding the Local Plan for the next 5 years? Instead the Council seems to prefer to hide such surveys inside a 2017 Insight Magazine which, presumably, only 668 of 79,000 residents actually noticed. I have certainly never met anyone who saw the 2017 survey.</p>	<p>This has been considered in the past and is something that we will explore for the Local Plan consultations, based on the timings of the consultation. The Local Plan Programme may not fall within the same timeframe as large mail shots. Borough Insight and E-borough Insight will always be used as they are accessible across the borough.</p>	
		<p>Face to Face Engagement 2.8.3 This area should be toughened up. MORE exhibitions MUST be held for significant consultations. Large manned ones at times when the community gathers...firework night, Christmas market, at the Playhouse, at Stoneleigh Lights on Broadway etc. etc. Additionally Smaller exhibitions MUST (not may) be held. Since the Council is currently targeting railway stations for higher/denser development, these locations would be a perfect place for manned or smaller exhibitions. Community halls, larger supermarkets, leisure centres, large post offices and libraries could all host smaller unmanned exhibitions.</p>	<p>Agree with all of these locations for exhibitions.</p>	
		<p>Written Notifications 2.8.5 Please PUBLICISE the fact that you have this Planning Policy Consultation database. No-one I know knows about it. Again, mention it when you contact each household on a one-to-one basis.....At council tax bill time..... at Christmas revised bin emptying time..... These are times when virtually every householder engages with the Council.</p>	<p>Noted</p>	

		<p>3. Planning Applications It is pretty evident that there is currently huge public concern in the Borough about recent large (and, in the view of most residents, inappropriate) planning applications for high/dense developments which are being 'foisted' on residents. The Community Involvement 2019 document should take a tougher line and REQUIRE (not just encourage) 3.2.3 'developers to consult with the local community before submitting applications which are likely to generate public interest' before they are submitted.</p>	<p>The Council encourages developers and applicants to undertake a level of public consultation prior to submitting a planning application. This is advocated in paragraph 40 of the National Planning Policy Framework which also states that local planning authorities should 'encourage' take-up of any pre-application advice and engagement with the local community. This cannot be insisted upon and is not a statutory requirement.</p>	
		<p>3.2.9 Again, the Council must do more than encourage. It must REQUIRE developers to undertake a (high) level of public consultation. Additionally, Methods of Publicity (Figure 6) should be much more onerous for Major Developments than for minor developments. It is ridiculous that a householder should have to publicise their domestic development to the same extent as a Developer.</p>	<p>The Council encourages developers and applicants to undertake a level of public consultation prior to submitting a planning application. This is advocated in paragraph 40 of the National Planning Policy Framework which also states that local planning authorities should 'encourage' take-up of any pre-application advice and engagement with the local community. This cannot be insisted upon and is not a statutory requirement.</p>	
		<p>3.7 Consulting on Planning Applications EEBC must FURTHER EXCEED the minimum requirements set out in T&CP (DMP) Order 2015 which are an insult to people potentially affected by a development. For Major Developments more Notices and letters should be required - perhaps to every house and every lamp post within a 100m radius of the proposed development. The cost of these notices/letters should be borne by the Developer.</p>	<p>The Planning Legislation is clear in what form we are required to communicate. At present this is via a letter to adjoining land owners, and or a site notice (with very specific wording) and if necessary advertisement in the newspaper. In addition we are required to maintain a register of applications that can be viewed. Over and above this the weekly list published on the website and also the planning register.</p> <p>There is no mechanism available to us to be able to insist that developers take these types of costs.</p>	

SCI.23.	Michail Michalakopoulos	<p>Your 2019 masterplan has a paragraph re. Stoneleigh, right at the end of the document (p65): "A detailed study should be undertaken to help explore how redevelopment could help to deliver much needed housing in a high density format in this highly sustainable location."Whom are you kidding? You already know what it is you want to do with Stoneleigh: densify it to oblivion.. and you source for all of this? a flawed survey with a less than 1% response rate.It pains me to explain to you the so many ways your documents are flawed. Hopefully the documents/letters you have been receiving lately from upset residents have been explaining this to you. How you have completely misinterpreted the NPPF and cherry picked (and still managed to get wrong), pieces of that document to suit your carriers development, not the borough's communities and prosperity. How you have completely misinterpreted the NPPF and cherry picked (and still managed to get wrong), pieces of that document to suit your carriers development, not the borough's communities and prosperity.</p> <p>Densification can be thoughtful and still respect the surroundings, but your document is entirely misleading showing three and four storey buildings next to parks and green areas (masterplan 2019). Artists impressions completely fail to convey the uglification process you have embarked on with parts of the borough. The council should be fighting back irrational housing demands, and where densification is required (questionable but for the sake of argument, let me accept this), the council should be meaningfully engaging with the residents to get something positive and meaningful out of it.</p>	These comments are not specifically related to this consultation. No Action Required.	
SCI.24.	Sue Hibbs	<p>The level of engagement all sounds very impressive and the tone of the document suggests that a lot of the consultation is happening now rather than a wish list for the future. However, the impressive sounding levels of engagement do not stack up against the number of high-rise planning applications that appear to be flooding Epsom and Ewell with little or no consultation. A glossy looking 25 page document is all very well but there needs to be proper action, not just words.</p>	Noted.	