

Appendix B

Old Oak and Park Royal Development Corporation

Revised Draft Statement of Community Involvement

Statement of Consultation

October 2019

1. Introduction

OPDC consulted a draft revised Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) from 13th June to the 26th July 2019. Four consultation responses were received on the draft revised Statement of Involvement, providing forty six individual comments.

This document presents all comments provided on the draft revised SCI as part of the consultation, as well as OPDC officers response to these comments. Where a change is proposed in response to specific comments, this is noted in the officer response.

The draft revised SCI was consulted on alongside OPDC's draft Engagement Strategy. The Engagement Strategy has been prepared by OPDC Communicants and Engagement team and relates to OPDC's broader role as a Development Corporation. Consultation responses received relating the Engagement Strategy will be published as part of a separate consultation statement.

2. Comments and Responses

General Comments

R.No.	C.No.	Name	Organisation	Para/ Figure	Comment	OPDC Officer Response
A	1	Simon Talbot-Williams	Raban Management Ltd	-	<p>I write in response to the consultation on the Statement of Community Involvement Update and Engagement which is currently being carried out by OPDC until 26 July.</p> <p>We are the owners of the Former Railway Institute Building and associated land at Goodhall Street (indicated by land parcel 1, edged in red in the plan below).</p> <p>In addition we are in ongoing dialogue with the land owners of the other land parcels 2, 3 & 4. Representations have been made on behalf of Raban Management Limited throughout the OPDC local plan process in terms of the future development potential of this site, and that of the wider land area.</p> <p>Having reviewed the Old Oak and Park Royal Draft Engagement Strategy, fig 1 in the introduction section is entitled 'Map of OPDC area and community clusters' and shows the 6 areas covering the OPDC area.</p> <p>It shows the land area owned by Raban as being within area 3 (Support development of land adjacent to Old Oak Common Station, HS2 work sites and North Acton). It also shows the area comprising sites 2, 3 and 4 as being within an area of green land (although this could just be blue on top of yellow and a colour error). This is different from the green area of zone 6 on the plan (A great public space at Wormwood Scrubs) and is thought to be a drafting error where the blue area has been overlaid on the yellow. The zoomed in image below, whilst not great quality demonstrates the area in question.</p> <p>The Former Railway Institute Building (currently 11 residential units & car parking) and associated land is not considered to be required to 'support development of land adjacent to Old Oak Common Station, HS2 work sites and North Acton'. The site is situated within the Old Lane Conservation Area and is mentioned within the Character Area Appraisal for this area. It is therefore a site which relates to the undesignated area to the South more than any other.</p> <p>Given the context and location of sites 2,3 and 4 it is suggested that they also better relate to the residential land to the south and it is suggested that they are put into the same designation as this land within the updated document prior to adoption.</p> <p>I look forward to receiving an update on this document prior to adoption.</p>	Noted. This issue will be considered as part of any further amendments to the Engagement Strategy prior to consideration by OPDC Board.

Comments relating to Section 1 – Introduction

R.No.	C.No.	Name	Organisation	Para/ Figure	Comment	OPDC Officer Response
B	2	Henry Peterson	Old Oak Neighbourhood Forum	Para 1.3	<p>The timetable for adoption of the OPDC Local Plan shown at paragraph 1.3 is already out of date. Examination sessions in public will not conclude until mid July, and OPDC has accepted in responses to the London Assembly Budget and Performance Committee that adoption before early 2020 is now unlikely. Major modifications to the current Draft Plan will need to go through a further round of public consultation.</p> <p>The OPDC's original SCI followed on from discussions with the Grand Union Alliance and the Old Oak Interim Neighbourhood Forum. The Grand Union Alliance (GUA) had previously organised a well-attended session at which a speaker from Bristol explained the '10 groundrules' for engagement and involvement which local community organisations had negotiated with Bristol City Council as part of that council's SCI preparation.</p> <p>Versions of these groundrules have subsequently been followed in other parts of the country. This background is briefly explained at 1.9. The way in which these groundrules are incorporated into the OPDC SCI remain important to local residents and community groups.</p>	Noted.

R.No.	C.No.	Name	Organisation	Para/ Figure	Comment	OPDC Officer Response
B	3	Henry Peterson	Old Oak Neighbourhood Forum	Para 1.10	<p>Paragraph 1.10c explains that these ground rules (renamed by OPDC as 'principles') apply to the OPDC as well as other parties in the planning process. OPDC SCI principles numbered 6 and 7 cover 'presenting options' and 'choosing between options' and are drafted as relating to applicants. Local community organisations and residents have long had concerns that OPDC in its Local Plan preparation has neither presented nor allowed any choice of options in relation to overall housing targets for Old Oak.</p> <p>The question over whether the targets included in the 2015 FALP and 2016 London Plan have ever been adequately justified and tested as part of the OPDC Local Plan process is a 'potential show-stopping matter' currently being assessed by Inspector Paul Clark as part of his Examination of the Draft Local Plan.</p> <p>Given this history, OPDC principles 6 and 7 need to make clear the OPDC position on consideration of options and 'reasonable alternatives' in the process of formulation Local Plans and Supplementary Planning Documents. It is unhelpful to the public if there is a gap between undertakings and commitments promised in a SCI publication and the reality of OPDC plan-making.</p> <p>Looking back at the Local Plan preparation process, we would not consider the Principle 5 on Early Involvement has been met. This states that This should occur before issues such as the height and scale of development are fixed when significant options are still open and while there is still the potential to make a difference to the plans. There is no evidence that local community views have been able to influence what is planned to emerge in terms of height or scale of development at Old Oak. While major changes have been made to the Draft Plan (particularly at Old Oak South) these have resulted from constraints imposed by HS2 and Network Rail. Local community views have had minimal impact.</p> <p>Hence we find it hard to accept that Principle 10d has been met, or even attempted to be met (this reads In making decisions on planning applications and planning policy documents, OPDC will carefully consider comments made during involvement and consultation on the application or plan).</p> <p>OPDC has taken the position at the EIP that there can be no 'reasonable alternatives' to the spatial strategy and quantum of housing proposed and allocated in the Local Plan, as a result of the need to conform with targets in the 2016 Local Plan. We believe this view to be an unorthodox (and potentially unlawful) view of the plan-making process applying to London. It allows for no testing of the realism and consequences of targets, via the plan-making process. Had this view of the unalterable primacy of the London Plan been expressed in previous versions of the SCI, it likely that it would have been challenged at an earlier stage.</p>	<p>No change proposed. Confirmation that OPDC will identify issues and options and select preferred options is stated within figure 2.1 and paragraph 2.10 as part of Stage 1 Preparation of the Local Plan (Regulation 18).</p> <p>In relation to points regarding targets and reasonable alternatives, please refer to OPDC's IIA Addendum (2019).</p> <p>In relation to the Local Plan consultation process according with Principle 5, OPDC has fulfilled this criteria within the strategic planning framework provided to the Local Plan by the London Plan and Old Oak and Park Royal Opportunity Area Planning Framework. Examples include ensuring development responds appropriately to the setting of sensitive locations, including heritage assets, open spaces and existing residential communities</p>
B	4	Henry Peterson	Old Oak Neighbourhood Forum	Principle 7 (a)	<p>Principle box 7a should be amended to include neighbourhood plans as part of the Development Plan (the Harlesden Neighbourhood Plan having now been 'made').</p>	<p>Changed proposed. Made Neighbourhood Plans will be noted as forming part of OPDC's Development Plan.</p>

R.No.	C.No.	Name	Organisation	Para/ Figure	Comment	OPDC Officer Response
C	17	Canal and River Trust	Canal and River Trust	Para 1.5	The trust welcomes many of the proposed principles for engagement in the development process in the OPDC area. However, whilst we note the wide definition of community in para 1.5, we consider that many of these principles are drafted with engagement with members of the public or residents / local business groups in mind. We would suggest that developers are also encouraged to undertake formal pre-application engagement with statutory consultees, where relevant, as this may help to ensure that issues are addressed prior to submission of the planning application. In addition to consultation with the Trust, we would also suggest consultation other waterway organisation (such as IWA) and waterway communities on both planning policy and development management matters.	No change proposed. The Statement of Consultation's role is to set out how OPDC involves, and expects applicants to involve, the community in deciding planning applications and preparing planning guidance, rather than all stakeholders which is addressed through legislation. Paragraph 2.11 and 2.22 refer to the regulations requiring OPDC to consult with the relevant stakeholders. This would include the Canal and River Trust.
D	18	Robin Brown	Grand Union Alliance	Para 1.3	Para 1.3: Local Plan timetable changed.	Change proposed. An updated timeline for Local Plan adoption will be included in the SCI.
D	19	Robin Brown	Grand Union Alliance	Para 1.6	Para 1.6: "hard to reach groups", although commonly used, is an unfortunate phrase to those so viewed. These groups do say that no one has really tried to reach out to them on terms to which they can respond. Principle 1c) also uses the phrase "difficult to engage groups" which is marginally better and could be used for consistency. However, before PPG was recently revised, the Local Plans PPG in para 017 referred to "those not usually engaging" and it is this phrase that the OPDC should consider using.	Change proposed. The final sentence of paragraph 1.6 will be amended as follows: "It includes additional detail on how OPDC may implement the requirements set out in the SCI, including strategies for informing and involving hard to reach groups and/or those not usually engaging in the planning process."
D	20	Robin Brown	Grand Union Alliance	Para 1.8	Para 1.8: Clarity on the protocol for affordable housing allocation between boroughs would be useful.	No change proposed. Officers do not consider the SCI an appropriate location to detail affordable housing nominations strategy. This information will be provided in other OPDC documents.
D	21	Robin Brown	Grand Union Alliance	Para 1.10 c	Para 1.10c): The Principles are for the OPDC in not only preparing planning policy, but also in development management. However, from reading the Explanatory Notes published alongside the Planning & Compulsory Planning Act 2004 on SCIs, a SCI is a statement of the authority's policy on involving interested parties in matters relating to development in their area. This would suggest that it is not simply dealing with planning applications, but other development proposals that are the subject of other consent regimes. Development proposals are also proposed for sites beyond the OPDC boundary and have significant implications for residents, businesses and other stakeholders within the OPDC area. The OPDC should apply the Principles in these instances, perhaps, going beyond the itemised authority functions listed in S18 of the P&CP Act 2004 in the interests of good practice. As stated in the consultation document (para 1.9) these Principles have a sound providence coming from earlier consultations and are well regarded by the GUA and, it is understood, by other Ipas.	No change proposed. The SCI sets how OPDC, as a local planning authority for its area, involves the community in preparing planning policy and in determining planning applications. OPDC cannot set out how the community will be or should be consulted on for proposals outside of the OPDC area.

R.No.	C.No.	Name	Organisation	Para/ Figure	Comment	OPDC Officer Response
D	22	Robin Brown	Grand Union Alliance	Principle 3	Principle 3 Continuity: That the OPDC will seek to work collaboratively with community groups and engage them in the co-creation and co-production of policy and proposals are not explicitly included here.	No change proposed. Chapter 2 sets out the processes for how OPDC will work collaboratively with and involve the community, including the Community Review Group, in preparing planning policy documents to deliver the proposed outcomes set out on page 9.
D	23	Robin Brown	Grand Union Alliance	Principle 5	Principle 5 Early Involvement: The 'Gunning Principles' of what makes for a fair consultation endorsed by the Supreme Court 29 October 2014* specially refers to "proposal is still at the formative stage". "Formative" is a key word that ought to be added so as to read 'Early Formative Involvement'. * http://www.bailii.org/uk/cases/UKSC/2014/56.html	Change proposed. The first sentence of Principle 5 will be amended as follows: "Arrangements should be made for the community involvement process to begin at the early formative stages of a plan or development proposals process."
D	24	Robin Brown	Grand Union Alliance	Principle 7	Principle 7 Choosing Between Options: It is 'development' rather than "redevelopment" that would capture a full range of proposals to be assessed against the development plan. Add in 'Neighbourhood Plan(s)' to what constitutes the development plan for the area.	Change proposed. The text of principle 7 will be amended so that "development" will be included in the text in place of "redevelopment", and Neighbourhood Plans will be highlighted as part of the development plan.
D	25	Robin Brown	Grand Union Alliance	Principle 9	Principle 9 Transparent Records: For viability assessments the onus is on full disclosure and any redacted parts should be fully justified. PPG Viability para 10 says "This National Planning Guidance sets out the government's recommended approach to viability assessment for planning. The approach supports accountability for communities by enabling them to understand the key inputs to and outcomes of viability assessment". It goes on to say more about transparency.	No change proposed. OPDC have recently amended the Local Validation Checklist to align with National Planning Guidance on the transparency of viability assessments. This is set out in Appendix 2 to the Local Validation Checklist available on the OPDC website .
D	26	Robin Brown	Grand Union Alliance	Principle 9	For planning obligations (S106), the draft heads of terms should be disclosed sufficiently early on in the process to allow local communities to influence what is required to mitigate the impact of a development. After all they have the lived experiences of living and/or working, accessing services etc. within the vicinity of a development proposal and understand the prevailing pressures or opportunities. The Town & Country Planning (Development Management Procedures)(England) Order 2015 No.595 Article 40(3)b requires proposed planning obligations be entered into Part 1 of the Planning Register. Simply publishing the Heads of Terms along with the Officer report to the Planning Committee 5 days before meeting is not good enough. For this denies the community being able offer their insights, knowledge and experience at a sufficiently earlier enough stage to be able to influence the outcome.	No change proposed. Wherever possible, OPDC will seek to agree Heads of Terms with applicants during the pre-application process and will encourage applicants to include draft Heads of Terms within the submitted planning statement. However, it is not always possible to fully agree Heads of Terms prior to submission and these can be subject to change as the potential implications of the development and the mitigation required is fully understood through assessment of the planning application.

Comment relating to Section 2 - Involvement in Planning Policy

R.No.	C.No.	Name	Organisation	Para/ Figure	Comment	OPDC Officer Response
B	5	Henry Peterson	Old Oak Neighbourhood Forum	Figure 2.1	<p>In Figure 2.1 the box on Stage 1 Preparation of Local Plan reads Identify and consult on main issues that the Local Plan needs to address and consider alternative policy options. As commented above, this reflects what most people see as the statutory position. But OPDC took the view that even at 'Regulation 18' stage. its Local Plan should proceed with no substantive policy options and on the basis of rigid conformity with targets within the London Plan.</p> <p>Given that the OPDC Local Plan will always be prepared in the context of a London Plan in force at the time (unless the legislative position changes) the Corporation needs to clarify its position on the London Plan/Local Plan relationship.</p> <p>Paragraphs 2.10 and 2.11 also need to be reviewed in the light of the position being taken by OPDC and its legal advisers in relation to consideration of 'reasonable alternatives'.</p> <p>Currently this section of the document does not explain the relationship between the London Plan and Local Plans as prepared by London's LPAs and MDCs. This needs to be summarised in the document, in terms that respect the statutory relationship between these tiers of London's planning system.</p>	<p>Change proposed. Paragraph 2.10 will be amended to include an additional final sentence stating:</p> <p>"Policy options identified can only be those which are 'reasonable' in accordance with Strategic Environmental Assessment legislation."</p>
B	6	Henry Peterson	Old Oak Neighbourhood Forum	Paras 2.20 - 2.27	<p>Paragraphs 2.20 – 2.27 cover Supplementary Planning Documents. The text explains that these provide 'additional guidance' and 'add detail' to the Local Plan. It would be helpful also to make clear that SPDs are non-statutory and cannot be used as a means of introducing new policy to a development plan.</p>	<p>No change proposed. It is not the role of the SCI to define the role and content of planning guidance documents. The role of a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) is set out in national guidance, the Local Plan and within SPDs themselves.</p>
B	7	Henry Peterson	Old Oak Neighbourhood Forum	Paras 2.20 - 2.27	<p>OPDC has prepared and published four of what it describes as 'Development Framework Principles' documents, as part of the suite of 63 supporting studies to the Local Plan. These have yet to be consulted on, albeit that they feature as evidence base documents in the Examination of the Draft OPDC Local Plan.</p> <p>The introductions to these 'Development Framework Principles' documents do not explain clearly their role and status. The content of some of them (e.g. Old Oak North Development Framework Principles, and its recent Addendum) are contentious. If the OPDC is to continue this vehicle of 'Development Framework Principles' (which is not a standard or recognised term for a Development plan document) their status should be explained in the SCI.</p>	<p>No change proposed. It is not the role of the SCI to define the role and content of Development Framework Principles. Their roles as supporting studies to the Local Plan and Supplementary Planning Documents are set out in the Development Framework Principles documents themselves.</p>

B	8	Henry Peterson	Old Oak Neighbourhood Forum	Paras 2.28 - 2.43	<p>Paragraphs 2.28 to 2.43 of the OPDC's Statement of Community Involvement have been revised and updated to reflect the new information requirements introduced by Parliament in the 2017 Neighbourhood Planning Act. This is a welcome step and the additional text would seem to meet the new statutory requirements. But the updated SCI gives no indication of whether the Corporation actively supports this community-led layer of the English planning system. The introduction to the SCI simply states that OPDC will offer appropriate support and assistance for Neighbourhood Planning. The OPDC does not have to declare a position on this issue. But it is significant that there are London Boroughs which show a more positive approach (e.g. LB Camden) and also those which are explicitly negative towards neighbourhood planning (e.g. Corporation of London). The SCI could usefully make clear where OPDC sits along this spectrum.</p> <p>As a Mayoral Development body, the OPDC needs to appreciate that come election time in 2020, statements made by the current Mayor on wishing to involve all Londoners in the planning process will be judged by the actions and publications of the GLA and its planning authority offshoots (LLDC and OPDC) rather than on warm words alone. To date, successive Mayors and Deputy Mayors since the 2011 Localism Act are seen to have a poor record in support for neighbourhood planning, as compared with Ministers and the Ministry of Housing and Local Government.</p> <p>The new London Plan, in its first published version, failed to recognise that London has had a three tier planning system (and not a two tier system) in the years since the 2011 Localism Act. This error has since been remedied through a 'minor modification'. There are now 13 'made' made neighbourhood plans in London, and over 700 across England. Further neighbourhood plans are reaching referendum stage in London.</p> <p>We accept that it is up to the OPDC Board to decide what position it wishes to take, in terms of its view of neighbourhood planning. But we would ask for clarity on the issue so that any further emerging neighbourhood forums in the OPDC area know where they stand.</p>	<p>Change proposed. OPDC's Local Plan policy DI3 and paragraph 11.36 sets out OPDC's commitment to supporting neighbourhood planning.</p> <p>A new paragraph will be inserted before paragraph 2.28 to reflect this wording as follows:</p> <p>"OPDC is committed to working closely with and providing support to emerging and established Neighbourhood Forums in the development of their neighbourhood plans. This commitment is set out in Local Plan policy DI3."</p>
B	9	Henry Peterson	Old Oak Neighbourhood Forum	Paras 2.44 - 2.57	<p>Community Infrastructure Levy</p> <p>Paragraphs 2.44 to 2.57 of the consultation draft cover this subject. Paragraph 2.44 makes no attempt to explain why OPDC remains one of only a handful of London planning authorities which has chosen not to introduce a CIL regime (despite having undertaken some of the preliminary stages). It would be helpful if the SCI could indicate what future direction OPDC is taking on this issue, now that Government has put in place decisions removing restrictions on pooling of planning obligations and clarifying previous uncertainties.</p> <p>Otherwise there will be a continued feeling amongst local community organisations and residents in the area that OPDC is opting out of a national scheme that is designed to raise funds to mitigate the impact of major developments, for reasons that are neither explained nor justified.</p>	<p>No change proposed. The SCI provides information for how OPDC will undertake consultation and engagement in the development of a Community Infrastructure Levy charging schedule. It is not the role of the SCI to set out OPDC's approach to CIL. This will be defined in other OPDC documents.</p>

B	10	Henry Peterson	Old Oak Neighbourhood Forum	Paras 2.54 - 2.57	Paragraphs 2.54 – 2.57 are a welcome statement of how OPDC would approach the allocation of the 15% or 25% element of Neighbourhood CIL. But this content remains irrelevant until the Corporation chooses to put a CIL regime in place. By contrast LB Brent (part of which Borough falls within the OPDC boundary) has been allocating significant NCIL funds to local community projects in recent years. That council has recently won the Award for Community Led Placemaking at the Planning Awards 2019 for its work on NCIL.	Noted
C	16	Steve Craddock MRTPI	Canal and River Trust	Paras 2.11 /2.22	The trust welcomes the engagement that took place with the OPDC through the preparation of the Local Plan. We believe that this should continue through the preparation of the subsequent relevant planning policy documents and master plans. The Trust is not a specific consultation body for the preparation of local plans but where our waterways are located in an authority area, we consider that the Trust should be seen as a general consultation body, as a landowner and guardian of an important historic, natural and cultural asset. Given the recognised importance of the Grand Union Canal (Paddington Arm) for placemaking within the OPDC area, we suggest there is the case for the Trust to be specifically referenced as a key consultee.	No change proposed. The Statement of Consultation's role is to set out how OPDC involves, and expects applicants to involve, the community in deciding planning applications and preparing planning guidance, rather than all stakeholders which is addressed through legislation. Paragraph 2.11 and 2.22 refer to the regulations requiring OPDC to consult with the relevant stakeholders. This would include the Canal and River Trust.
D	27	Robin Brown	Grand Union Alliance	-	Section 2 and, for example, paras 2.11, 2.12, 2.14, 2.17, 2.19, 2.24, 2.27, 2.47, 2.51a & 2.53: The GUA would encourage the OPDC to declare that it will make best endeavours to go beyond the minima required by Government regulations. For example, documents are not only available on the OPDC website and at City Hall, but also in local libraries and other community locations as appropriate. And in particular, the OPDC should follow the Government's Cabinet Office Consultation Principles 2018 – "G Consultations should take account of the groups being consulted: Consult stakeholders in a way that suits them. Charities may need more time to respond than businesses, for example. When the consultation spans all or part of a holiday period, consider how this may affect consultation and take appropriate mitigating action, such as prior discussion with key interested parties or extension of the consultation deadline beyond the holiday period". See: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/691383/Consultation_Principles__1_.pdf	Change proposed. OPDC considers that it does make best endeavours to go beyond minimum requirements. This includes locating consultation documents in various local venues, hosting consultation events, and being pragmatic and reasonable in timelines for consultation responses for different groups. Text clarifying OPDC's approach will be included in paragraph 1.9 as follows: "OPDC is committed to achieving a high level of community involvement and will seek to make best endeavours to go beyond statutory requirements where feasible and appropriate."
D	28	Robin Brown	Grand Union Alliance	Para 2.1	Para 2.1: Add in Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) – see OPDC webpage on the LDS.	Change proposed. Paragraph 2.1 will be amended to include CIL.
D	29	Robin Brown	Grand Union Alliance	Para 2.3	Para 2.3: Typos: 'Requests' rather than "Requested"; "also made by the OPDC's website" is a curious turn of phrase.	Change proposed. Typographic errors will be amended.

D	30	Robin Brown	Grand Union Alliance	Table 2.1	Table: Methods of Engagement: Add to "Press Releases" row, (press) 'advertisements' in order to be consistent with para 2.12d	No change proposed. Press releases as noted in the table are different in their nature and purpose to statutory press notices referenced in para 2.12 (d).
D	31	Robin Brown	Grand Union Alliance	Para 2.8	Para 2.8: For consistency, consider using similar wording to that proposed to be added to Principle 7a) to define the development plan. However, as with Principle 7a), add in 'Neighbourhood Plan(s).	No change proposed. The contents of the Development Plan is defined at Principle 7a) and this has been amended to include Neighbourhood Plans.
D	32	Robin Brown	Grand Union Alliance	Para 2.11 b) and 2.22	<p>Para 2.11b: (And there may be circumstances where some of the following comments apply also to para 2.22 on SPDs and to Neighbourhood Plan-making if there are significant environmental effects involved): The following comments have been sourced from representations made on various plans, including the draft new London Plan, by Just Space.</p> <p>European Commission's guidance accompanying the EU Directive discusses alternatives within plans (e.g. alternative policies) – 'internally'; and different or alternative options in preparing the Plan – 'externally'. It is also relevant to observe that ODPM guidance* (Appendix 6, p69) on developing and assessing alternatives states: "Stakeholders may usefully be involved in the generation and assessment of both strategic and more detailed alternatives through consultation. Demonstrating that there are choices to be made is an effective way of engaging stakeholders in the process." Consequently, the production of 'reasonable alternative options' at this first stage of plan-making should not only be signposted here at para 2.11b), but also the opportunity for community involvement in this.</p> <p>Close reading of still relevant Government Guidance** and the EU Directive for assessments has generated Just Space analysis (see Appendix below) that the required and recommended involvement of the public should occur at the early formative stages. (This is one of the basic requirements for a fair consultation endorsed by the Supreme Court). Public involvement is useful at Stage A, and ought to happen at Stages B and C. The ODPM guidance** on p10 applying EU Directive Article 6.1 & 6.2 explains that the public shall be given an early and effective opportunity.... to express their opinion on the drafts... at both Stages B and D.</p> <p>Appendix: Just Space Analysis of Guidance Involvement of the public at Stage A: Setting the context and objectives, establishing the baseline and deciding on the scope Just Space comment: Stage A identifies other relevant policies, plans, environmental protection objectives and the current state of the environment – baseline information and environmental problems; develops SEA objectives; and consults on the scope of the assessment. Fig 1 – The SEA Directive's Requirements on Consultation At Stage A (scoping stage) • authorities with environmental responsibility, when deciding on the scope and level of detail of the information to be included in the environmental report (Art. 5.4). [p10 ODPM Practical Guide]</p>	<p>Changes proposed. Paragraph 2.10 will be amended to include an additional final sentence stating:</p> <p>"Policy options identified can only be those which are 'reasonable' in accordance with Strategic Environmental Assessment legislation."</p> <p>The first sentence of Principle 5 will be amended as follows:</p> <p>"Arrangements should be made for the community involvement process to begin at the early formative stages of a plan or development proposals process."</p> <p>This would be carried out in light of reasonable alternatives available, including considering the planning framework provided during the generation of policy options.</p> <p>No change is proposed in relation to community involvement in identifying reasonable alternatives. Planning Practice Guidance Paragraph: 018 Reference ID: 11-018-20140306 states that "Reasonable alternatives are the different realistic options considered by the plan-maker in developing the policies in the plan."</p>

				<p>But see also para 5.A.2 Responsible Authorities need to consider what information they already have and what more they will need. They may already hold useful information, for example from environmental assessments of previous plans or programmes. It may be useful to consult the public at this stage to seek additional information and initial opinions. [[p26 ODPM Practical Guide]</p> <p>And Appendix 3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other consultees, including representative bodies and members of the public, who often have a wealth of knowledge and understanding of the strategy or plan area, e.g. local conservation groups. <p>Involvement of the public at Stage B: developing and refining alternatives and assessing effects</p> <p>Just Space comment: Stage B tests the plan’s objectives against the SEA objectives; develops strategic options including reasonable alternatives, predicts/evaluates the effects of the plan and alternatives, considers mitigating and maximising beneficial effects; and proposes monitoring measures.</p> <p>Fig 1 – The SEA Directive’s Requirements on Consultation</p> <p>At Stages B, D</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • authorities with environmental responsibility and the public shall be given an early and effective opportunity within appropriate time frames to express their opinion on the draft plan or programme and the accompanying environmental report before the adoption of the plan or programme (Art. 6.1, 6.2). <p>[p10 ODPM Practical Guide]</p> <p>Appendix 6 developing and assessing alternatives</p> <p>“Stakeholders may usefully be involved in the generation and assessment of both strategic and more detailed alternatives through consultation. Demonstrating that there are choices to be made is an effective way of engaging stakeholders in the process. The alternatives considered throughout the process must be documented and reasons given on why they are or are not taken forward.” [p69 ODPM Practical Guide]</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--

D	33	Robin Brown	Grand Union Alliance	Para 2.14	After para 2.14: There should be a similar paragraph to that at 2.12 here setting out additional actions that the OPDC commits to in following the Principle 3 Continuity. That involvement is a continuous process and is of a constant consistency and scale as “continuity” implies. Rather than repetition, perhaps, this can be abbreviated. Note that para 2.12’s use of Local Plan’s preparation clearly only refers to Stage 1 Preparation of the Local Plan.	Changed proposed. The following paragraph will be inserted following paragraph 2.14. "In addition, OPDC: a) Issues a statutory press notice, advertises in local press, uses the OPDC email newsletter and its social media sites to raise awareness; and b) Holds drop-in events / exhibitions in the local area"
D	34	Robin Brown	Grand Union Alliance	Para 2.36	Para 2.36: This refers to para 2.45 which is part of the CIL Section. Perhaps, it should reference para 2.30.	Changed proposed. Paragraph reference will be corrected.
D	35	Robin Brown	Grand Union Alliance	Para 2.56	Para 2.56: The Old Oak Neighbourhood Forum has referred to the award winning LB Brent’s arrangements of working with local communities in determining priorities. Whilst not yet studied by the GUA, you may well be advised to consider whether its procedures should be adopted by the OPDC.	Noted.

Comments relating to Section 3 - Involvement in Planning Applications

R.No.	C.No.	Name	Organisation	Para/ Figure	Comment	OPDC Officer Response
B	11	Henry Peterson	Old Oak Neighbourhood Forum	Paras 3.3 - 3.6	<p>Paragraph 3.3. explains that all applications in the North Acton area delegated to the London Borough of Ealing to determine on behalf of OPDC. There is no explanation of why this delegation arrangement was put in place in 2015, or whether it will continue indefinitely?</p> <p>Since 2015, new developments in North Acton granted planning permission by LB Ealing have had a much greater impact on the ground than those in the eastern half of the OPDC area (where Oaklands remains the only sizable development under construction). The new towers in North Acton, and the predominance of student and 'build-to-rent' studios and small units are widely viewed by local people as reflecting some of the worst examples of urban renewal in London. The public realm remains unattractive, dominated by roads and with narrow and windswept gaps between tall buildings.</p> <p>The current delegation arrangement, and lack of public confidence in the planning decisions of LB Ealing, are adding to comment and questions as to 'what is the OPDC for, and is it delivering any added value?'</p> <p>There is also much confusion amongst residents (understandably) as to which body is making which decisions and why? At the very least, the updated SCI should offer some rationale to explain why LB Ealing continues to be responsible for development in North Acton and whether this arrangement is expected to continue into future decades?</p> <p>Paragraph 3.6 does not explain why OPDC does not have a Scheme of Delegation with the London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham and what are the implications of this different arrangement from those with LB Brent and LB Ealing.</p>	No change proposed. While the SCI sets out details of the scheme of delegation for information purposes, it is not the role of the SCI to set out the rationale for this, or the circumstances in which it may be revisited.
B	12	Henry Peterson	Old Oak Neighbourhood Forum	Paras 3.11 - 3.12	<p>The advice given to applicants in 3.11 and 3.12 on how to engage with the public at pre-application stage is fairly standard. As acknowledged, the OPDC cannot require a deeper level of engagement by developers.</p> <p>As compared with an earlier version of this revised SCI, as considered by the OPDC Planning Committee in February 2019, a paragraph has been added on 'Stakeholder Workshops'. This replaces a section of the previously adopted SCI (at paragraph 3.12) on 'Planning Forums'. The deletion of this aspect of pre-application consultation was commented on at the Planning Committee, and the reinstatement of material on this subject is welcomed.</p> <p>While the Community Review Group may prove an effective means of ensuring resident input at pre-application stage there is also a strong case for tripartite dialogue at an early stage of planned developments, involving applicant, OPDC planners, and local resident and amenity groups. This can avoid abortive work all round, as those London Boroughs which operate such arrangements have found.</p>	No change proposed. OPDC considers the comprehensive consultation and engagement processes to shape development proposals to provide appropriate community input.

R.No.	C.No.	Name	Organisation	Para/ Figure	Comment	OPDC Officer Response
B	13	Henry Peterson	Old Oak Neighbourhood Forum	Para 3.23	On paragraph 3.23, the OPDC's current online Planning Register is far from user friendly and does not compare well with systems used by most Boroughs. It is understood that a new OPDC website is in preparation, including an improved online planning sub-system.	Noted.
B	14	Henry Peterson	Old Oak Neighbourhood Forum	-	OPDC is one of a minority of London planning authorities which redacts the name and address of those submitting representations on planning applications. Each is labelled on the online planning file as a 'neighbour response'. OPDC argue that this practice is required by GDPR. Many other London LPAs continue to publish names and addresses, while publishing privacy notices and warnings to the public that this is the case. There is an obvious argument that publishing at least the postcode and street name of those making representations on planning applications aids transparency and is in the public interest. How else are the public at large to know from what geographic location a comment has been submitted, and how this relates to the applicant site? While there still appears to be a lack of definitive advice from the Information Commissioner or Local Government Association on this aspect of GDPR implementation, we urge OPDC to look again at reviewing its present redaction policy.	No change proposed. OPDC does not publish the full name or contact information of those making representations on planning applications. OPDC does, however, note the street name of respondents which indicates the geographic location of respondents in relation to applications.
D	36	Robin Brown	Grand Union Alliance	-	Section 3: The GUA would encourage the OPDC to declare that it will make best endeavours to go beyond the minima required by Government regulations. In any event, NPPG Consultation & Pre-decision Matters para 032 Reference ID: 15-032-20180615 sets out additional days for when public holidays fall within the minimum statutory periods.	Change proposed. OPDC considers that it does make best endeavours to go beyond minimum requirements. This includes locating consultation documents in various local venues, hosting consultation events, and being pragmatic and reasonable in timelines for consultation responses for different groups. Text clarifying OPDC's approach will be included in paragraph 1.9 as follows: "OPDC is committed to achieving a high level of community involvement and will seek to make best endeavours to go beyond statutory requirements where feasible and appropriate."
D	37	Robin Brown	Grand Union Alliance	Para 3.5	After Para 3.5: No map of the Schemes of Delegation appear in the Consultation document although it was indicated in the Tracked Changes version presented to the Planning Committee in March 2019.	Change proposed. The map outlining the scheme of delegations will be included.
D	38	Robin Brown	Grand Union Alliance	Para 3.6	There is still confusion among the public about different types of planning applications and which lpa is dealing with them. Bringing to bear clarity and an explanation of the rationale behind the Schemes of Delegation would be helpful.	No change proposed. It is not the role of the SCI to define the role and content of Development Framework Principles. Their roles as supporting studies to the Local Plan and Supplementary Planning Documents are set out in the Development Framework Principles documents themselves.

R.No.	C.No.	Name	Organisation	Para/ Figure	Comment	OPDC Officer Response
D	39	Robin Brown	Grand Union Alliance	Para 3.7	Para 3.7: The relevant NPPF 2019 paragraph is no longer para 66. Certainly there is more explicit focus on the process of scheme design, particularly in terms of local engagement, and can be usefully quoted.	Change proposed. Text will be amended to reference the following text from paragraph 128 of the 2019 NPPF: "Design quality should be considered throughout the evolution and assessment of individual proposals. Early discussion between applicants, the local planning authority and local community about the design and style of emerging schemes is important for clarifying expectations and reconciling local and commercial interests. Applicants should work closely with those affected by their proposals to evolve designs that take account of the views of the community. Applications that can demonstrate early, proactive and effective engagement with the community should be looked on more favourably than those that cannot.
D	40	Robin Brown	Grand Union Alliance	Para 3.8	Para 3.8: The relevant NPPG quotations have yet to be check against a recent flood of updated guidance, but para 3.8 does set out convincing principal points which should be retained more or less as stated.	Noted.
D	41	Robin Brown	Grand Union Alliance	Para 3.11	Para 3.11 – 1: It is noted that the last sentence of the current SCI is to be deleted. But the re-expression of the current paragraph in paras 3.20 & 3.21 "Stakeholder Workshops" is welcomed.	Noted.
D	42	Robin Brown	Grand Union Alliance	Para 3.23	Para 3.23: A more generic reference to the Gazette would embrace the editions for boroughs of Kensington & Chelsea and Hammersmith & Fulham.	No change proposed. OPDC will normally use the two stated publications for press notices, but this does not exclude of other publications if this is deemed appropriate.
D	43	Robin Brown	Grand Union Alliance	Para 3.25	Para 3.25: It is noted that this refers to strategic (rather than major) developments as does para 3.20 ("significant development proposals which are of strategic importance"). Whereas paras 3.14 & 3.16 refer to major schemes. Distinguishing between these terms may well be deliberate so that the scale and degree of involvement varies. But please double check wording for consistency and clarity.	Change proposed. Definitions of major and strategic development will be included within the glossary for clarity.
D	44	Robin Brown	Grand Union Alliance	Paras 3.31 - 3.32	Paras 3.31 & 3.32: The GUA expressed support in principle at the EiP for the relevant draft policies DI3 and EU9 (and also texts to EU3 & D6), albeit that some reordering be brought to bear (monitoring biodiversity is missed out). It trusts that there will be a 'policy hook' in any adopted Local Plan as planning neglects to do thorough research into 'what actually works/what does not work' and such surveys will help correct this.	Noted.

Comments relating to Section 4 - Assessment and Monitoring

R.No.	C.No.	Name	Organisation	Para/ Figure	Comment	OPDC Officer Response
D	45	Robin Brown	Grand Union Alliance	-	Section 4: Although in response to earlier consultations on the SCI the GUA has requested annual tracking of views and experiences of a representative survey group of residents, community groups and businesses, it seems that it is of the Engagement Strategy that this request should now be made.	Noted. No change proposed. OPDC will be undertaking quantitative tracking surveys to assess local views. The Engagement Strategy contains further detail on how feedback from the local community will be garnered on an ongoing basis.

Comments relating to Section 5 – Glossary

R.No.	C.No.	Name	Organisation	Para/ Figure	Comment	OPDC Officer Response
B	15	Henry Peterson	Old Oak Neighbourhood Forum	-	The glossary entry for Neighbourhood Plan includes a final sentence As such, they much be in conformity with OPDC’s Local Plan. Apart from the typo of ‘much’ for ‘must’ the legal requirement is that neighbourhood plan policies must be in general conformity with the strategic policies in a Local Plan. The qualifications ‘general’ and ‘strategic’ are legally important, in that they allow for NP policies to vary and depart from Local Plan policies that are ‘non-strategic’ and within limits seen as ensuring ‘general’ alignment. The current wording in the Glossary is legally inaccurate, and (whether by accident or design) is discouraging to those considering embarking on a neighbourhood plan.	Change proposed. The definition for neighbourhood plans will be amended as follows: " As such, they must be in conformity with the strategic policies of OPDC’s Local Plan and the London Plan."
D	46	Robin Brown	Grand Union Alliance	-	Section 5 Glossary: The Consultation document does not appear to have been updated as per the Tracked Changes document presented to the Planning Committee March 2019. For example, ‘Documents’ should appear after the phrase “Supplementary Planning”. Comments on the updated version in the Tracked Changes document are as follows: Development Plan – state the Act from whence comes the Section quoted; DPDs – add West London Waste Plan; LDS – add CIL; NPPF – reference the 2019 version; SA – specify the Act NP – ‘must’ rather than “much”.	Change proposed. The changes to the glossary shown in the tracked change version of the draft SCI will be made to the final version of the document.