

date	who by	which list	comments	action
22/01/2008	Stakeholders- Sean O Mahoney/John Coleman	householder & LB -	delete requirement for larger scale drawings of doors windows etc . Are of view it can be conditione	NO CHANGE The requirement is in the national validation checklist for Listed Buildings and for full applications plus LBs. The insertion in the local list for householders & LBs was to correct this anomaly.
25/01/2008	PC seminar participants	householder	request requirement for existing floor area & proposed floor areas to be given. dimensioned block plans- distance from boundary	Existing and proposed floor areas are not required on the current householder form and it is considered this would serve no purpose since the size of the increase can be viewed from the plans. The request for dimensioned block plans is agreed-it is a useful tool for viewing plans on the web.
		householder & LB	dimensioned plans	Requirement to be added to householder applications. When the neighbours view the plans they most frequently wish to know the height of the building and its distance from the boundary
31/01/2008	NFDC	all	query biodiversity requirements	No Change. The District Ecologist is preparing a companion checklist to assist applicants with biodiversity requirements and a link to this will be added when it is finalised.
30/01/2008	NWDC	all full	links for affordable housing & S106 In NWDC <a href="http://www.northwiltshire.gov.uk/index/env/planning/localplans/ldf/affordable_housing_spd.htm">http://www.northwiltshire.gov.uk/index/env/planning/localplans/ldf/affordable_housing_spd.htm</a> <a href="http://liveinternet.northwiltshire.net/index/env/planning/developmentcontrol/protocol_for_major_applications_and_section_106-2/major_applications_protocol_legal_agreements-2.htm">http://liveinternet.northwiltshire.net/index/env/planning/developmentcontrol/protocol_for_major_applications_and_section_106-2/major_applications_protocol_legal_agreements-2.htm</a>	to be added
30/01/2008	Bulford Parish Council		1. The only comment, in response to the Consultation, from this Parish Council refers to the proposed application for both TPO Work and non-TPO Work in a Conservation Area 2. As it is understood:- a. Work on a tree on which there is a TPO requires Permission. b. Work on a tree (above a specific dimension), on which there is no TPO but which lies in a Conservation Area, requires a mere Section 211 Notification of intent. The onus is then on the Planning Authority, within a restricted time frame, to either apply a TPO on the tree or trees in question or not: failing a TPO within this time frame, work may legally go forward.	
			3. If this is correct, it is considered misleading to incorporate both categories of work in one Application document. There is already considerable confusion about the issue amongst members of the public and it is submitted that this is likely to compound this confusion. Moreover, there are sections in the proposed Application which go beyond the legal requirement for a simple Section 211 notification (namely, paras 4, 7, 8).	NO CHANGE Whilst it is accepted that this has the potential to cause confusion 1APP is a national form and the Local Planning Authority have no discretion..
			4. Clearly, a Notification must include the location of the trees) on which work is intended and, clearly, it would be helpful and constructive for information to be given at the same time as to type, condition, and age. But it is believed that the legal requirement under a Notification goes no further than this.	
			5. It is submitted, therefore, that an Application form should not be instituted which gives the impression that more information is required and more control is required to be exercised than, in fact, is required by law. To do so would be symptomatic of the creeping bureaucracy that is all too prevalent today.	

date	who by	which list	comments	action
			6. As a separate but associated matter, this Council has often been told in the past (by a succession of District Arboriculture Officers) that there are quite strict national criteria which must be followed before a TPO is put in place; it would be very helpful if this Council could be guided as to what these criteria are.	
29/01/2008	English Heritage	all	Thank you for consulting us on your draft local checklist for the validation of planning applications which we welcome.	
			In order to offer detailed advice on any application we require a full understanding of the impact of the proposed works on the historic environment. We also need to understand why the changes contained in an application are proposed. Our publication, A Charter for English Heritage Advisory Services contains a guide to the range of information required for consultations with English Heritage. This guide is reproduced at Appendix A below.	
			We believe that the items set out in Appendix A are required by local authorities to determine applications. These items are what we require if there is to be a genuine invitation to give advice as set out in ODPM Circular 08/2005.	
			The glossary and guidance that your authority gives to applicants to ensure that the required documents are clear and unambiguous should therefore reflect the content of our Charter. The Government guidance on the Validation of Planning Applications published on 7th December 2007 included many of these items. We would like to offer the following general comments on the local checklist and the glossary of terms:	a link to the English Heritage charter can be provided
			Planning statements, Listed Buildings Appraisals, Conservation Area Appraisals or Heritage Statements (as described in the CLG guidance) should take account of the impact on and the setting of the historic environment, which includes individual historic assets. For example, applications for planning permission for development may affect the setting of a listed building, scheduled monument, battlefield, conservation area, registered park or archaeological remains. They may also have an impact on the surrounding environs and these issues need to be addressed in any appraisal. Within these requirements we would look to find a statement of the significance of the historical and archaeological interest of a site as well as a state of justification for the works. This information could help inform the decisions your authority has to make and we strongly advise your authority to request the same categories of information as indicated in our charter.	These matters should be covered in the design and access statement and in the case of LBs - the heritage statement embodied in it.
			Design and Access Statement requirements as set out in DCLG Circular 01/2006 must be fully reflected in checklists. When a planning application is submitted in parallel with an application for listed building consent for example, a single combined statement should address the requirements of both. We would also suggest that reference to the CABE guidance Design and access statements - How to write, read and use them may assist the applicant.	There is already guidance on the council's website in relation to Design and Access Statements
			Where English Heritage is a statutory consulted on an application, using our Charter will help to ensure we receive genuine invitations to give advice in order to offer meaningful advice.	
			APPENDIX A	
			GUIDE TO THE RANGE OF INFORMATION REQUIRED FOR CONSULTATIONS WITH ENGLISH HERITAGE ON PROPOSALS AFFECTING NATIONALLY IMPORTANT HISTORIC ASSETS	

date	who by	which list	comments	action
			The type and amount of information needed may vary according to the kind of development proposed. The following items may be necessary to assess the impact of changes to the historic environment:	
			A plan showing the site, its location, extent and context	on national list
			Photographs, dated, numbered and cross-referenced to a plan, showing the site and its context in general and the area of proposed change in detail	photographs/photomontages to be added to householder & LBC checklist
			A statement of significance which demonstrates an understanding of the historical, archaeological and architectural interest of the site	heritage statement referred to in local list .
			Measured drawings as existing and as proposed to show, where appropriate:	Covered in national requirements
			all floor plans	Covered in national requirements
			any external and internal elevations affected by the works	Covered in national requirements
			sections through floor, roof and wall structures, where these are affected by the works	Covered in national requirements
			perspectives or photomontages, models or computer visualisations, to show the impact of new works on the heritage asset and its setting	covered in local list
			landscape works, to include contours and planting schemes	covered in local list
			other material necessary to provide a full understanding of the impact of the works on the significance of the historic asset and its setting	heritage statement referred to in local list .
			Drawings should be at a scale appropriate to show the impact of the proposals on the historic asset and its setting, usually 1:50. Plans, elevations and sections as existing should indicate elements proposed for demolition.	not mentioned specifically
			A written explanation of the proposed works to include:	
			an assessment of the impact of the works on the significance of the asset	heritage statement referred to in local list .
			a statement of justification explaining why the works are desirable or necessary (this should include development appraisal where appropriate)	should form part of design and access statement
			an archaeological assessment or field evaluation and a mitigation strategy, where important archaeological remains may exist	covered in local list
			a structural report by an engineer familiar with historic assets, which identifies defects and proposes remedies, when works include significant elements of demolition or rebuilding	covered in local list
			When proposed works include the total or substantial demolition of a listed building, or any significant part of it, the statement of justification should be based on the following criteria, as set out in detail at 3.19, PPG15:	The requirement for a demolition statement and a link to appendix A can be added to LBC & full app/LBC checklists
			the condition of the building, the cost of repairing and maintaining it in relation to its importance and to the value derived from continued use	
			the adequacy of efforts made to retain the building in use, including evidence that the building has been offered on the open market at a realistic price	
			the merits of alternative proposals for the site	
07/02/2008	CAA	All	The CAA supports the principle of electronic communication and the streamlining of administrative processes in general. However it should be remembered that adequate safeguarding consultation as described in ODPM Circular 1/2003 is essential for safety. While in favour of streamlining where practical, we would not support any measure which resulted in a safeguarding consulted being unable to assess the safety implications of a proposal for lack of information. In such circumstances that consultee would be likely to object to the proposal rather than risk unknown problems. Contact me in the case of any difficulty.	The checklists should enable adequate information to be provided.

date	who by	which list	comments	action
11/02/2008	Mike Holm EA ( in DC team meeting	all	Add Locally identified areas of flood risk to the criteria for a FRA	To be added to all checklists
07/02/2008	Environmental Health		I have had a quick look at the application forms, principally the general application form as it is probably most relevant.	
			the sustainability checklist makes no reference to Air Quality. Currently I am working with west wilts EH on proposed guidance for developers in connection with air quality. The checklist should ask whether a development is in an Air Quality Management area and whether the development is liable to have a detrimental impact on air quality having regard to the national air quality objectives set down in Air quality regulations. The whole of the city centre is an Air quality management area and in west wilts there are AQMAs in Bradford upon Avon and in Westbury. Developers will need to include mitigation measures to prevent further deterioration of air quality.	Air Quality is a separate issue identified in the checklists which does ask for an assessment if the development is in AQMA
			With regard to the sustainability guidance document,	
			this is an existing document - not part of the validation checklists	this is an existing document - not part of the validation checklists
			Useful publications could include:	
			'Guidance for the redevelopment of Housing on land affected by contamination' R&D publication 66 Environment Agency/ NHBC	This could be added as link under the land contamination criterion
			If I think of anything else I will let you know.	
14/02/2008	Tim Pizzey( verbally)		The idea of a covering general advice note as a foreword as on SSDCs validation checklist	link proposed to DCLG guidance list if feasible
	Tim Pizzey( verbally)		Clarification of the EIA situation in relation to Validation- screening opinion within 3 weeks of validation.	could be added as a note
21/02/2008	Cllr Leo Randall via Janet Wallace	all where there are drawings involved	dimensioned drawings - as cannot scale from web.	Householder applications - block plans , and elevations to be dimensioned. to be added
				All full applications- block plans to show dimensioned distance from boundaries to be added
04/03/2008	Wilts wildlife trust	all	Supports use of these checklists. Request amendment to include county wildlife sites( after SSSI) in ecological asesment requirements. Should be considered for all types of development not just disused land.	to be added.