

Consultation responses

Consultee	Comments made	Our response
Historic England (HE)	The consultation process detailed in the document should be adequate in meeting the requirements of the Local Development Regulations 2004. HE stress that it is important to ensure that stakeholder organisations with interests and responsibilities in the historic environment are fully involved throughout the consultation process.	The comments on who to consult regarding the historic environment are noted and updated within our planning application software system. No change necessary to the document.
Tim Murphy CPRE Surrey	There should be clearer and more prominent publicity regarding the use of the planning application search on the web site.	These comments are noted and the wording changed on our new website to direct customers to this planning application search facility. No change necessary to the document.

<p>Mike Waite Surrey Wildlife Trust</p>	<p>The document is clearly drafted and very helpful. SWT particularly welcome the early reference to biodiversity on page 3. Concerning the section on the Duty to Co-operate (pages 10-11), 'Strategic approaches to biodiversity conservation' might be added to the bulleted list as a further example of cross-border issues, although they realise this list is not intended to be comprehensive. With reference to page 15, the Localism Act 2011 effectively makes the Surrey Nature Partnership (along with LEPs) a statutory consultee under the 'Duty to Co-operate', although this is routinely more relevant to Planning Policy consultations rather than Development Management.</p>	<p>Officers have added the term strategic biodiversity conservation to the bullet points on page 11. The comment regarding the Surrey Nature Partnership is noted and the commentary on page 15 has been altered to reflect that the list is not exhaustive. The statutory consultation bodies that we have specifically identified are the more common ones.</p>
---	---	---

Mike Ford Tree Advisory Board (TAB)	TAB commented that they think the broad thrust of the document is excellent. They raise two concerns - the use of neighbour consulting letters only for applications for works to Tree Preservation Orders and that works to trees in conservation area notifications will only be on the website.	Officers have considered these points carefully and do not propose to make alterations to the ways of notification in respect of these two types of application. We are now seeking to direct customers to our website where they can register on our public access area and receive regular (weekly) information about applications in their area. The cost of site notices at £12 per notice (without factoring in officer time in displaying them is prohibitive). Officers are also mindful that these applications are some of our more technical ones - for example - the consideration in respect of a tree in a conservation area is binary - we allow the work or we don't and we TPO the tree. This is a technical judgement surrounded by specialist advice and legislation rather than the broader impact assessment used in planning applications.
Natural England	Supports the principle of meaningful and early engagement, but are unable to comment in detail.	Noted.
Sarah Clayton	More information is needed about signing up for application alerts.	Officers have updated the new website to help with this issue. No change to the document is proposed.