

APPENDIX D Communication

Name	Submission/suggestion	Officer comment	Impact	Recommendation
Atworth	It would be very helpful and would speed up the process if the case officer could provide their e-mail address when the application is sent to the parish.	Sensible suggestion but it will have to be a 'generic' address otherwise critical e-mails may go astray if officers are absent on leave or ill etc.	Time taken to amend IT systems.	Agree change.
Berwick St James	The village is asked to comment on planning applications. However, in a recent case, the comments of the village were overruled without any further discussion with the chairman. Therefore a meeting was held with Mr Brad Fleet, who was extremely helpful. Before the formation of the unitary council, the SDC planning department overruled the decisions of the village on at least 3 cases in the past 3-5 years.	<p>The volume of applications received and resources available preclude officers responding to parish and town councils every time their views differ from planning officers.</p> <p>Where there is clearly a distinct problem every effort is made to do so but this is not a practical proposition in most cases.</p> <p>Officers make recommendations based on the council's adopted and national planning policies.</p>	More staff resources would be required if it became obligatory to contact parish and town councils to discuss every recommendation that differed from their consultation response.	No change to current practice.
Berwick St John	Result (hard copy) not sent to parish clerk as it used to be.	The council is increasingly moving to IT based communication and has invested heavily in its web site. All planning application details, plans and decision notices are readily available on line.	Sending paper copies of documents available on line is both expensive and labour intensive.	No change to current practice.
Biddestone & Slaughterford	We feel sidelined – questions not answered, especially at first try. This will be more serious if proposals to exclude listed buildings and conservation area proposals are accepted. Our only hope of being heard is through our elected councillor.	<p>Every effort is made to answer specific queries. A recommendation of this report is to change the scheme of delegation to allow listed building, conservation and advertisement applications to be called in by Division Members.</p> <p>(The Scheme of Delegation seems to have been misinterpreted by</p>	N/A	N/A

Name	Submission/suggestion	Officer comment	Impact	Recommendation
		some parishes which have interpreted the existing situation whereby Division Members cannot call in these categories of application as meaning they [the parishes] will not be consulted on them which has never been the case. They are and will remain a statutory consultee on these categories.)		
Bishopstone	Allowing us three weeks during which to reply has been a great improvement. We have abandoned the standard form for response because it did not meet our needs. We are mindful that we must give a full response because we would not get a second opportunity if an application went to appeal.	The consultation period for parish and town councils is prescribed by government but the council makes every effort to be as flexible as possible and will discuss individual cases with parishes if they have particular problems meeting a deadline.	N/A	No change to current practice.
Box	<p>I feel that all town and parish councils should be sent a copy of the weekly application list showing all plans that have been registered.</p> <p>All closing dates for planning applications should be the same i.e. consultation dates, weekly lists, registration dates, neighbour letters and call-in dates for unitary members. Paper and web dates should also match.</p>	<p>The weekly list contains details of all applications registered within a hub area and parishes are normally only interested in applications within their own geographic area. Sending them all this information may not be welcome but it is a simple matter to add interested parishes to the e-mail circulation list.</p> <p>Ideally closing dates should be the same – and officers have some sympathy for this proposal but unfortunately the only way it would work would be if the council went to the latest common denominator, which is precisely the opposite of what the council is seeking to achieve through Lean - to put in place a means whereby the council can deal with applications at the</p>	<p>Minimal admin input to add interested parishes to e-mail circulation list. A 'paper copy' option would be resource intensive and should not be offered.</p> <p>Bringing all of the dates together will add unnecessary delay to a large number of the simplest applications the council processes. The current legacy computer systems will not accommodate such a change in any event. (Without substantial investment at a time when the council is looking to replace</p>	<p>Ask parishes if they would like to be sent an electronic version of the relevant weekly list of applications registered.</p> <p>There is room for improvement in bringing some of the dates together, but it won't be possible to bring them all together as this would mean delaying without due cause applications that customers want determined.</p>

Name	Submission/suggestion	Officer comment	Impact	Recommendation
		<p>earliest possible date. This meets the customer requirement for a speedy decision and supports good development by either throwing out poorly thought out developments at an early stage or allowing uncontroversial ones to flow through as quickly as possible.</p> <p>The intention is to bring some of the dates into line, i.e. align the deadline for the neighbour letter with the closing date for the site notice. As these are set for 28 days from when admin produce the site notice and letters, this means that the applications on the weekly list should also fall within the same period. Assuming that admin are registering applications within 3/4 days, it provides the potential for determining non controversial applications within 35 days.</p> <p>Bringing all the dates into line frankly becomes too much for the computer systems to handle very easily, because some applications have to be advertised with press notices, pushing back the earliest date for determination. The council does not want to extend the earliest decision date for non 'press' applications which would delay determination of non-controversial applications. As the weekly list operates as a 'sweeper', picking up all the applications for the previous week, it currently ties in well with the 28 day period for</p>	<p>these very systems)</p>	

Name	Submission/suggestion	Officer comment	Impact	Recommendation
		neighbour/site notice consultation. Extending it to 28 days would mean that an application that may have come in at the beginning of that period can't be determined for over 35 days, an unnecessary delay.		
Bradford on Avon	<p>It would be helpful if the compliments slip with the planning application number was stapled to the planning application because as it is loose it often goes missing. Ideally have a space for the application number on page 1 of the form.</p> <p>You cannot read the comments on the website for some planning applications. For example, W/09/03175/FUL it says 13 comments but you cannot access them.</p>	<p>A valid criticism, the current process is flawed and could be improved.</p> <p>This is probably a technical shortcoming of the existing western hub computer software where the 'related information' tab does not provide the information expected. Users have to go to the 'Associated Documents' tab.</p>	<p>Minor administrative resource input to make changes.</p> <p>Substantial investment would be required to 'fix' this problem and it is not considered appropriate at a time when the council is looking to replace this system.</p>	<p>Parish/town council comment sheets should be reformatted and automatically populate all necessary information, including the application number and consultation response date.</p> <p>No investment be made to fix this problem.</p>
Broughton Gifford	<p>The parish council makes comments on all applications, based on its local knowledge and information known at the time. However, it is unaware of the relevant planning officer views on any application before it submits its comments. The planning officer could have issues/concerns that the parish council could address within its comments if it knew of them beforehand.</p>	<p>Recommendations are only formulated after all consultee responses have been received and taken into account in the decision making process.</p> <p>(Although officers may have a fair idea of which way an application is heading, it would be tantamount to pre-judging an application if this was communicated before responses from all consultees were to hand.)</p> <p>(Parishes are automatically consulted as soon as applications are registered and in some cases, before the application has reached</p>	<p>This suggestion is not practical/possible.</p>	<p>No change to current practice.</p>

Name	Submission/suggestion	Officer comment	Impact	Recommendation
		the case officer.)		
Castle Combe	<p>Communication from planning officers very poor. No response to any comment the council makes. In fact no consultation appears to take place.</p> <p>Very difficult to contact officers as most seem to work part time.</p>	<p>Parishes are statutory consultees and are notified of all applications received.</p> <p>The volume of applications received precludes officers responding to parish and town councils every time their views differ from planning officers.</p> <p>Where there is clearly a distinct problem every effort is made to do so but this is not a practical proposition in most cases.</p> <p>Part time working is something the council cannot avoid and has to make every effort to accommodate.</p>	<p>More staff resources would be required if it became obligatory to contact parish and town councils to discuss every recommendation that differed from their consultation response.</p>	<p>No change to current practice.</p>
Charlton & Wishford	<p>There is a lack of communication with parish councils when processing amendments to planning applications. Whilst parish councils receive an initial planning application, any subsequent amendments made by the applicant are not always forwarded to the parish council for consideration. Additionally, all subsequent amendments agreed between the applicant and the planning department must be communicated to parish councils in order that there is total transparency and openness of the whole procedure. It appears that, at present, the planning department takes the arbitrary decision on whether to send the amendment to parish councils. This must not happen and all amendments, regardless of their scale must be sent to parish councils for comment.</p>	<p>Investigation has shown that there are different consultation practices on amended plans in place in different hubs.</p> <p>There needs to be a consistent approach and this is captured in the recommendation.</p> <p>Notifying parishes of every amendment request, especially where there is no impact will place a large burden on officers. Almost all schemes are amended at some point and the changes are often very minor – moving a door half a meter, or transposing a door/window. On larger multi house residential schemes there is an almost constant exchange of</p>	<p>Limited resource implications to harmonise working practices across the four hubs but there are resource implications if officers are required to notify parishes of every change to a plan, irrespective of whether or not it affects anyone.</p>	<p>Only material amendments that have an impact should be notified to parish and town councils: -</p> <p>Amendments submitted pre-decision</p> <p>Non material amendments to a scheme which do not affect anyone – No consultation but the plans to be placed on the web site.</p> <p>Major Change – No consultation if no one affected but plans to be placed on the web site.</p> <p>Major change which affects</p>

Name	Submission/suggestion	Officer comment	Impact	Recommendation
	<p>The planning department appears reluctant to meet parish councillors on site to discuss and view proposed applications, which is not in the spirit of openness as referred in the Planning Enforcement Policy (5.10 "Openness").</p>	<p>correspondence with the developer dealing with non material change requests which can result from ground conditions, price fluctuations, purchaser requests.</p> <p>In order to deal with the volume of applications, officers fit site visits in 'as and when' and simply cannot operate/deal with their workloads if they have to time visits to meet parishes on site.</p> <p>Officers have legal authority to enter sites and often undertake visits when no one is home. Parish representatives do not have authority to enter private land and specific consent for them to do so would have to be sought from the applicant/agent adding further delay.</p> <p>The Government's legislation ensures that parishes are consulted but does not require representatives of the local</p>	<p>Agreeing to meet parishes on site will severely delay the processing of applications.</p>	<p>people – Re-consult the neighbours and parish/town/city councils but giving them 14 days to respond rather than 21.</p> <p>Amendment requests made post decision</p> <p>Non material change (Which do not affect anyone) no notifications but plans placed on file and web site.</p> <p>Major change – Will require submission of a new planning application</p> <p>No change to current practice.</p>

Name	Submission/suggestion	Officer comment	Impact	Recommendation
		<p>planning authority to meet with them to discuss cases. If a parish has a particular concern it can telephone or e-mail the case officer to discuss (who may then decide a site meeting is appropriate). In most cases a written representation can quite adequately convey the parish view, as envisaged by the legislation.</p>		
Codford	<p>The PC was informed of a planning application coming to committee on a Friday- the meeting was the following Wednesday- not much time to prepare.</p> <p>There is an ongoing problem when the PC request information from development control- an electronic acknowledgement then nothing for months. If we ask for an update on a situation at present an issue with domestic encroachment into agricultural land that began 3 years ago - put off for planning permission of next site, put off for building on next site to be complete, put off until Wiltshire Council in force. Question as to present status not responded to. Ongoing would be fine but unless we constantly chase the matter up if anything is being done the PC remain in the dark. The supposedly response within a period of time has been a problem for us on other matters- we ask questions then have to chase them up months later.</p>	<p>Again, there appear to be slightly different practices at work in the four hubs.</p> <p>Anyone who makes representations on an application should be given sufficient notice of a committee date.</p> <p>This is an issue about the enforcement process which is the subject of a separate review. These comments have been forwarded and will be taken into account as part of that review process.</p>	<p>People and parishes are already notified so no resource implications to ensure a standardised approach is adopted.</p> <p>N/A</p>	<p>That every effort should be made to ensure that everyone who made representations on a 'committee application', including town/parish/city councils and applicants/agents, should be given five clear working days notice of the date of the meeting.</p> <p>N/A</p>
Corsham	<p>That there is not enough communication. The website is often unavailable. On amended/additional plans it would be extremely</p>	<p>There have been prolonged problems with the web sites for the four planning hubs which have</p>	<p>Changes/improvements already in hand so no resource implications.</p>	<p>Review consultation documentation/process with parishes.</p>

Name	Submission/suggestion	Officer comment	Impact	Recommendation
	useful to have the amendment clearly marked on the application so that it is easily identifiable.	<p>caused serious difficulties for both the community and staff. The IT service took steps in December 2009 to address the main issues and reliability has improved drastically.</p> <p>Setting out exactly what amendment/changes have been made when consulting on amended plans has been less than perfect with officers assuming too much knowledge/technical plan reading ability on the part of the recipients.</p>	<p>More time will have to be spent by officers making it explicit in consultations on amended plans what the changes are.</p> <p>E-mail sent.</p>	Officers need to make it clearer in consultations on amended plans what the changes are.
Cricklade	By and large good, however there are examples where our comments appear to have been ignored or not taken into account. Considerable time and effort is made locally to consult and comment on applications as well as dealing with local enquiries from the public on behalf of WC which is not sufficiently recognised.	<p>Parishes' comments are always taken seriously and acted upon wherever possible. The council has to carry out a balancing act and it is inevitably the case that someone, an applicant or objector/supporter is disappointed in the outcome.</p> <p>The council has to act reasonably and is always at risk of 'costs' if it makes an unreasonable decision and an appeal is lodged. It is the decision making body and while it takes account of consultee responses; it cannot simply concur with them on every occasion. It has to take into account wider local and national policy considerations.</p>	N/A	N/A
Dilton Marsh (also Semington, Westwood and Wingfield)	The docket sent with planning applications showing the application number, case officer and 'comments to be received by' information invariably states that 'comments to be received 21 days from' the date (presumably) that the application was sent to the parish council. This	Different hubs use different response forms which need to be harmonised and improved when a single new IT system is forthcoming.	Small level of resource input to review response proformas.	Review consultation documentation/process with parishes. Parish/town council comment sheets should be reformatted and automatically populate all necessary

Name	Submission/suggestion	Officer comment	Impact	Recommendation
	<p>is misleading and the 21 day count has already started well before the PC receives the planning application. The date for comments should be 21 days from the date of the official notification of that planning application in the planning application list. The date from which the 21 days is counted should be the date of the printed list of planning applications that is sent to each PC.</p> <p>The information on the docket should be typed – some handwriting is almost illegible.</p> <p>This docket should be stapled to the planning application. It is too easily lost. Each sheet of the planning application should be stamped with the number of the planning application.</p>	<p>Stapling will probably annoy as many parishes as it pleases and parishes should be encouraged to reply by e-mail in any event. Stamping each sheet of every copy of a planning application is incredibly time consuming and can no longer be justified. The file copy is stamped and copied to the web. It should be possible for the relevant parish to keep the file together.</p>		<p>information, including the application number and consultation response date.</p> <p>They should be printed with no need for handwriting</p>
Enford	We do not have enough experience of the current system (as compared to the old district council) to make a judgement yet.	N/A	N/A	N/A
Grafton	The website for East Wiltshire is often down, making it difficult to view applications etc.	There have been prolonged problems with the web sites for the four planning hubs which have caused serious difficulties for both the community and staff. The IT service took steps in December 2009 to address the main issues and reliability has improved drastically.	Changes/improvements already in hand so no resource implications.	N/A
Grittleton	All applications for Listed Building Consent,	The Scheme of Delegation seems	N/A	N/A

Name	Submission/suggestion	Officer comment	Impact	Recommendation
	<p>regardless of whether they have an accompanying application for full planning permission, should be distributed to parish councils for their comments.</p>	<p>to have been misinterpreted by some parishes which have interpreted the existing situation whereby Division Members cannot call in these categories of application as meaning they (the parishes) will not be consulted on them which has never been the case. They are and will remain a statutory consultee on these categories.</p>		
Ham	<p>The method of communication between the planning department and parish councils needs to be streamlined. There should be a standardised format for replies (perhaps including a checklist) by parish councils, so that both planning department and parish council have a clear understanding of what information is being sought and what particular areas of concern, e.g. construction traffic access, may arise from approval of a planning application.</p> <p>Overall there is a lack of clarity concerning Wiltshire Council's planning guidance criteria, specifically as they affect the work of the various parish councils. Where planning criteria exist, too often they appear to be overridden by the WC planning department without explanation to the relevant parish council, creating confusion over which criteria parish councils should properly be pursuing.</p>	<p>It is clear that further work is necessary on exactly what proforma information is sent to parishes to help improve communication.</p> <p>Hopefully future training proposals will help address the desire for more information on planning criteria and the way recommendations are formulated.</p>	<p>Small level of resource input to review proformas and consultation methodology.</p> <p>Training will be provided as part of the council's normal service.</p>	<p>Review consultation documentation/process with parishes.</p> <p>Training opportunities to be provided.</p>
Heytesbury, Imber and Knook	<p>The planning lists and actual plans used to be sent in the same envelope. Not only was this more economical, it made it much easier to keep track of the applications and decisions. The response date used to be placed at the top of the application lists, but now each plan comes in piecemeal with plus 21 days to work out.</p>	<p>This process was changed when the former West Wilts District Council revised its processes in 2007. As each application has a 21 day consultation period it was decided then to send applications out as and when registered rather than to 'batch' them which put pressure on deadlines.</p>	<p>Small level of resource input to review proformas and consultation methodology.</p>	<p>Review consultation documentation/process with a view to parish/town council comment sheets being reformatted and automatically populated with all necessary information, including the application number and consultation response date.</p>

Name	Submission/suggestion	Officer comment	Impact	Recommendation
	<p>Also, our PC meets monthly and any plan that comes within a week of a previous meeting needs permission for an extension to the response date. I have often emailed for this permission and received no reply, only to call and be told by reception that I need to email! I have often been made by planning reception to feel a nuisance when calling and often have to repeat all the info when put through to an officer.</p>	<p>These comments have been passed to the relevant admin team and it is anticipated that improvements will result. In this case the e-mail address to use is developmentmanagementwest@wiltshire.gov.uk advising that they require an extension of time and when they will submit their comments by. This correspondence will then be passed to the case officer and the inbox will automatically generate an acknowledgement.</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>Provide more information to parishes on contact details for extension of time requests.</p>
<p>Heywood</p>	<p>a). Generally the consultation communications process have to date worked satisfactorily, but we do have reservations over Wiltshire Council's drive towards electronic consultation.</p> <p>(b). Notwithstanding, sending weekly notifications by email of new planning applications submitted and decisions made is welcome. However, town/parish councils must continue to receive hard copy of all papers connected to individual application sent for comment.</p> <p>(c). The proforma for local council responses to planning applications should have a 'No Objection' box. It is possible to not actively support an application but at the same time to have no objection to it. Similarly, in some cases it could be invidious for a local council to 'support' a particular application rather than not objecting to it. Absence of any comment at all seems to suggest weakness. Furthermore, the statutory framework does not require local councils to support, but it does invite them to express objections.</p>	<p>A review of the electronic vs paper copy consultation process is due to take place later this year after a year's operation of a mixed process. No changes are proposed before that review is completed.</p> <p>This seems to be a sensible suggestion.</p>	<p>N/A</p> <p>Small level of resource input to review proformas and consultation methodology.</p>	<p>N/A</p> <p>Review consultation documentation/process with parishes.</p>

Name	Submission/suggestion	Officer comment	Impact	Recommendation
Hilperton	We would like to make it clear that we feel strongly that the increase in the use of electronic communication should not extend to plans, which must continue to be sent out in paper form.	A review of the electronic vs paper copy consultation process is due to take place later this year after a year's operation of a mixed process. No changes are proposed before that review is completed.	N/A	N/A
Idmiston	We have lost the acknowledgement of our responses to planning applications. Given that we always send ours in by email and we always ask for a "Read receipt" why cannot this be given by the person receiving the email in the Salisbury hub?? Parish and town councils do not have the human resources to check websites to see if our response has been received and such a suggestion as has been made in totally unacceptable as technology will permit the read receipt with no effort from staff and at zero cost to the authority.	There have been different procedures in place in different hubs. In the south there has been an auto-acknowledgement set up for some time but occasionally this fails. The fault has been reported. A similar facility could be set up in each hub and this is being pursued on generic email addresses.	Minimal resource implications.	Suggested change is already in hand.
Kingston St Michael	The council is very concerned about late changes to applications. We often do not get these until very late, and sometimes in the same envelope as the decision. Sometimes the alterations change the character of the development, and the council would like to be able to comment on the final plans, not interim ones.	There is clearly scope to improve the consultation process on amendments to planning applications and review what documentation is sent to parishes and when.	Limited resources needed to undertake review.	Review consultation on amended plans to simplify and clarify what is being consulted on and what is being sent 'for information' only.
Laverstock and Ford	All would seem to be working well save for the processing of R2 as the officer concerned has been withdrawn on another project. This part of the service worked much better under SDC.	The former R2 funding officer has been working on the Lean Review of the service but has continued to process R2 payments. There was a problem with payments early in the life of the new council but this has been resolved. R2 and Section 106 funding across the county have now been consolidated under one post.	N/A	A new administration/monitoring process is already being put in place.
Limpley Stoke	We believe it imperative that the council consult with the parishes on planning applications. They	N/A	N/A	N/A

Name	Submission/suggestion	Officer comment	Impact	Recommendation
	<p>provide local knowledge, which may not be available to the planning officers. They also consider the observations of the residents, many of whom believe that simply informing the parish council of their views is sufficient for their opinion to be considered, without the need to contact the County Council directly.</p> <p>Telephone contact with planning officers works well, with calls returned and answered. The new email format for weekly & decision lists is satisfactory.</p> <p>However, the Parish Response Template, would benefit from an additional tick box, where the council neither supports nor objects to an application, but merely would like to pass on knowledge or local opinion. This may help the planning officer to consider how policy may be affected, or to be able to set criteria in which an applicant must co-operate.</p>	<p>As above, this seems to be a sensible suggestion</p>	<p>Small level of resource input to review proformas and consultation methodology.</p>	<p>Review consultation documentation/process with parishes.</p>
Minety	<p>Feedback from planning officers would be appreciated, particularly when the decision opposes the parish council observations.</p>	<p>The volume of applications received precludes officers responding to parish and town councils every time their views differ from planning officers.</p> <p>Where there is clearly a distinct problem every effort is made to do so but this is not a practical proposition in most cases</p>	<p>More staff resources would be required if it became obligatory to contact parish and town councils to discuss every recommendation that differed from their consultation response.</p>	<p>No change to current practice.</p>
North Bradley	<p>Time scales when we only meet once a month are too short</p>	<p>The consultation period for parish and town councils is prescribed by government but the council makes every effort to be as flexible as possible and will discuss individual cases with parishes if they have particular problems meeting a deadline.</p> <p>Parish councils need to make suitable internal arrangements</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>No change to current practice.</p>

Name	Submission/suggestion	Officer comment	Impact	Recommendation
		(almost all do) to respond to consultations on time		
Potterne	Now that the parish councils are the only other level of local accountability their comments should be considered more carefully.	Parish comments have and always will be considered carefully.	N/A	N/A
Purton	No we are reasonably happy with the communication we have with officers. We would however like more notice taken of our requests for involvement in important issues such as S106 discussions with developers especially if ultimately the parish council will be invited to take on further devolved services. Also a particular concern of ours at the moment is the impact the potential 3,000 houses to the west of Swindon will have on our parish. We fear too much emphasis is put on this being an urban extension of Swindon rather than a massive growth of dwellings in Purton parish which is the reality. Even if the number is reduced to the original 1,000 identified in the Structure Plan this will still significantly impact on our parish.	<p>Heads of Terms for S106 Agreements are made available on request (they are not 'exempt' documents) but it would make eminent sense where there are specific implications for parish and town councils to involve them at an early stage.</p> <p>In most cases this already happens and they are signatories to some agreements but there is obviously scope for improved communication.</p> <p>The S106 implications for Purton vs Swindon have been raised through other channels and are being addressed.</p>	Minor resource implications.	The council considers the implications of S106 agreements on parish councils and keeps them abreast of developments where appropriate.
Salisbury City	Have always found the planning staff, both in the development service and forward planning very willing, helpful and approachable. They have always been very willing to allow attendance at meetings and put forward views etc.	N/A	N/A	N/A
Southwick	When receiving revised planning applications it is not always obvious what the revisions are, particularly if it is a large application. It would therefore be helpful if a list of revisions/ amendments could be provided with the plans.	There is clearly scope to improve the consultation process on amendments to planning applications and review what documentation is sent to parishes and when.	More time will have to be spent by officers making it explicit in consultations on amended plans what the changes are.	Officers need to make it clearer in consultations on amended plans what the changes are.
Stanton St Bernard	Too few examples to make any comments on.	N/A	N/A	N/A
Stanton St Quinton	I feel that all town and parish councils should be sent a copy of the weekly application list	See response to similar 'Box' parish query above.		

Name	Submission/suggestion	Officer comment	Impact	Recommendation
	showing all plans that have been registered. All closing dates for planning applications should be the same i.e. consultation dates, weekly lists, registration dates, neighbour letters and call-in dates for unitary members. Paper and web dates should also match.			
St Paul Malmesbury Without	Generally the communication is entirely satisfactory particularly when using the on-line facility to submit comments, further telephone communication is always helpful with the exact information supplied promptly however our one area of concern is general email correspondence with officers. This rarely gets an acknowledgement which is poor customer service and certainly discourteous - a brief one sentence response takes no time to construct and allays concerns that the original message has gone astray.	Sensible suggestion.	Minor resource implications and hopefully this function can be automated.	Officers to acknowledge receipt of electronic correspondence.
Trowbridge	We are pleased that Wiltshire Council continues to accept our tabulated reporting of comments on planning applications and does not insist on us having to complete a single form for each application.	N/A	N/A	N/A
Urchfont	Surprised at number of minor apps. still coming forward. Also surprised quite substantial alterations can be made to properties in conservation areas without needing planning permission, e.g. painting brickwork & changing windows to PVC. On the whole current arrangements appear to be working very well.	Information could be provided through training opportunities to clarify what is, and is not permissible in conservation areas.	Training will be provided as part of the council's normal service	Training opportunities to be provided.
Warminster	The only issue on consultation is often due to timing of meetings. We have been able to obtain extensions of a few days if necessary to ensure that we can get remarks forwarded to the planning officer.	As mentioned above, consultation periods are prescribed but the council does try to be as helpful as possible where individual cases are brought to its attention.	N/A	N/A
West Knoyle	West Knoyle parish council has only been consulted on one minor planning application since April and we therefore feel that we have too little experience of communication on which to base a well-informed response.	N/A	N/A	N/A

Name	Submission/suggestion	Officer comment	Impact	Recommendation
Winsley	Yes. The tick box on the pro-forma for submitting comments is misleading in the context of the entitlements and expectations of parish councils as independent statutory consultees on planning applications.	As mentioned above, the wording of the proforma has room for improvement.	Minor resource implication.	Review and amend consultation documentation.
Woodborough	E-mail notification of planning applications is generally working well. However, it is considered that the notification e-mail should always contain the complete application number in the subject line. This would assist council members in searching for the application on the Planning Explorer website when links are not provided within the e-mail (confusion over the abbreviated number sometimes used has occurred).	Sensible suggestion.	Minor resource implication.	Review and amend consultation proforma.
Cllr Allison Bucknell	I have not had any call to use this, however I do support the current system, it seems to have streamlined the planning meetings.	N/A	N/A	N/A
Cllr Ernie Clark	The member call-in period should be longer and should be widened to include advertising applications. Also, provision needs to be made for circumstances in which the local member is not available to call-in e.g. resignation, holiday, sickness, death.	<p>The call in period is dictated by the time needed to process applications within Government performance targets, especially if called in for committee consideration which involves report and agenda/committee lead times. Officers will always try and accommodate requests where there have been particular problems.</p> <p>The covering officer report for the adopted Planning Code of Good Practice stated that it is open to any member to nominate a colleague to undertake planning duties if they have a conflict of interest, or are absent for any reason. The ability to nominate</p>	Minimal resources needed to update the Code.	<p>No change to current practice.</p> <p>Amend the Planning Code of Good Practice to clarify additional reasons that justify nominating a colleague for planning duties.</p>

Name	Submission/suggestion	Officer comment	Impact	Recommendation
		where there is a conflict of interest has been captured in the Code but the other examples have not and this needs to be clarified.		
Cllr Richard Clewer	I think that the 21 day notice period for a member call in is too short. I do not believe we should call applications in unless members of the public raise the application with us (or it is an application on a previously contentious site). It often takes members of the public longer than 21 days to get wind of an application and raise it as an issue with us. I strongly feel that a longer time period is needed, especially given the larger size of wards in the new council to ensure that we can raise issues of concern to residents.	The call in period is dictated by the time needed to process applications within Government performance targets, especially if called in for committee consideration which involves report and agenda/committee lead times. Officers will always try and accommodate requests where there have been particular problems.		
Cllr Mary Douglas	It is vital that members are able to call in planning applications to be decided by committee. This option must never be removed	There is no intention of removing Member's call in ability.	N/A	N/A
Cllr Peter Hutton	There seems to be confusion between parish and unitary councillors, unitary councillors are not obliged to call in just because parish disagree.	Part of the reasoning behind call in by Division Members only was to ensure there were always robust planning reasons for applications to be considered by committee. (Prior to the creation of Wiltshire Council minor applications regularly appeared on agendas without a proper planning justification. This resulted in long agendas and meetings, and considerable resource spent preparing reports on applications with little or no community impact.) Councillors should only call in applications where they believe there are genuine planning reasons that merit committee consideration and not simply because they have been asked to.	N/A	N/A

Name	Submission/suggestion	Officer comment	Impact	Recommendation
Cllr Judy Rooke	Householders should also be allowed to call in an application not only the Unitary Member. For instance if five householders sent letters of objection - then the application should go to committee. The town council should be considered as well if they object to be part of the five objectors ie four householders plus the town objection, so as to get the application in front of the committee. It is unfair and unreasonable that just the unitary councillor is allowed to call in an application to the committee.	<p>It is the quality of objection, rather than the number which is important. Many letters of objection contain no relevant planning considerations and petitions signed by all and sundry also cause problems.</p> <p>Parish/town councils are consulted on applications and can support members of their community by writing in and their comments are always given serious consideration.</p> <p>Parishes and householders can still ask for applications to be determined by committee, they simply have to do so via their local Division Member. This route of call in ensures that parishes stay in touch with councillors and that the local councillor is fully aware of the merits of any given case and can speak to it when the application appear on an agenda.</p>	<p>If call in by householders is re-instated, agendas will take much longer to compile, meetings will last longer as will decision making.</p> <p>Performance against the Government's National Performance Indicators will decline.</p> <p>Officers will be able to spend less time on the more strategic and important applications.</p>	No change to current practice.
Cllr Carole Soden	It seems to be working well. However, members receive the weekly list of planning applications, what we do not receive is information on what has happened to applications that are determined by officers and not called in. Parish councils are informed but not local members.	<p>Again, the hubs are operating differently. Apart from the North hub a list of delegated decisions is sent out to members along with the weekly lists of newly registered applications.</p> <p>It should be a simple matter to bring the North into line with the other hubs.</p>	Minimal resource implications.	Amend notifications sent to members in the north to include a list of decisions made under delegated powers.
Cllr Dick Tonge	Amended plans cause problems for parish councils when they receive copies of plans and there is no indication on the plan or the covering correspondence of what the actual amendment is. Further confusion arises when they are sent copies of minor amendments to schemes 'for	The documentation covering amended plans needs to be improved to assist local councils and remove ambiguity.	Small level of resource input to review proformas and consultation methodology.	Review and amend consultation documentation.

Name	Submission/suggestion	Officer comment	Impact	Recommendation
	<p>information' (the changes having already been agreed by officers) but the fact that they are for information is not made explicit.</p> <p>The current procedure should be improved so it is made clear what the amendments are and which are for information only.</p> <p>The generic e-mail addresses for the four planning hubs are not user friendly, i.e. developmentmanagementeast@wiltshire.gov.uk</p>	<p>Agree that the names are far too long but the service was told these were what it had to use. The service has now been using them for nearly a year and they have become accepted and embedded. There are now a number of reasons which make it difficult to change now: -</p> <p>We will have to let all the agencies we work with know and they will have to change them at their end - four times over as we have four separate addresses for the hubs - so this is a fair amount of work for our consultees/partners like the planning Inspectorate; planning portal; English Heritage etc. (It took the service a while to get them sorted out first time around!)</p> <p>The service will have to change all of its site notices, neighbour letters, appeal letters etc - so a fair bit of work involved – four times over;</p> <p>The service would have to keep both addresses open for a period so that nothing is missed which means more work for IT and monitoring officers.</p>	<p>A fair amount of resource input, both by the Council and our partners, is necessary to change these addresses now.</p>	<p>No change is made to the generic e-mail addresses.</p>

Name	Submission/suggestion	Officer comment	Impact	Recommendation
	<p>The wording of the current 'Member's call in form' could lead to an allegation that the member completing it had prejudged the outcome of an application by expressing a desire for it to proceed to committee, depending on whether the application 'should be recommended for approval/refusal.</p>	<p>Officers believe that the current form is a necessary and pragmatic method of establishing which applications actually need to go to committee. If the "should the application be recommended for approval/ refusal" wording were to be deleted from a practical point of view this would mean that twice as many applications would then go to committee for determination.</p> <p>Ideally, there would be an early discussion between the councillor considering a call-in and the case officer, which would enable the councillor to decide whether or not a call-in was necessary. In those circumstances the highlighted words would not be needed but this does not always happen.</p> <p>Something does need to be done, however, and the position of the councillor could be made clearer by including on the form words along the following lines:-</p> <p><i>For the avoidance of doubt the exercise of my right to call in this application should not be taken to imply any predetermination on my part. My final decision [as a member of the planning committee] will depend on the information, representations and advice available when the matter is before</i></p>	<p>Minimal resource implications to change the proforma wording.</p>	<p>Change already implemented so no further action required.</p>

Name	Submission/suggestion	Officer comment	Impact	Recommendation
Comms Team	The weekly lists of applications registered should be circulated to councillors via the Elected Wire	<p>Ideally the council should offer councillors a choice about how they would like to be informed about new planning applications. Placing the weekly lists onto the Elected Wire could be a 'default' option.</p> <p>This could be an easy and will be explored with the IT team.</p>	If it turns out that there are large resource implications to make this a reality using the legacy planning systems, officers would rather wait until a single county wide software package is in place before exploring further.	Investigate putting the weekly lists onto the Elected Wire.