

Commenter	Comment	Response	Action taken
Cllr Kenyon	<p>On page 8 formal notices it says that there is a need to use the Hereford Times newspaper.</p> <p>My thoughts: the paper circulation is falling week on week and before long may not even be in existence the council needs to look at other means.</p> <p>Social Media I believe is the way forward, the mission is to inform the community of planning applications and the like surely the reach of sites like Hereford Voice and Your Hereford and other local based community social media sites around the county would do a better job.</p> <p>The cost implication of using papers against social media is also huge, savings could and would be made.</p> <p>If this is a forward looking report we must look to the future.</p>	<p>I consulted Luenne Featherstone about this matter. Her response was as follows: <i>As not everybody is online (and even of those that are many people don't use social media) we do still place adverts in print media. This is always in addition to information via social media.</i></p> <p>I also asked her about Hereford Voice and Your Hereford. Her response was as follows: <i>We do not send an email to them as they are not accredited media, however they are signed up to our website newsroom so automatically get all of our news. They also often work off of our social media feeds rather than our press releases as it is already in a suitable format.</i></p>	No change
Cllr Watson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are a number of spelling mistakes in the document re: Councilors - UK English should be councillors (2 x lls) • How does this document link to and reflect changes in the updated Planning section of the Constitution, eg. flowchart? 	<p>Noted</p> <p>As Anne Gerzon was the reviewer of the report and document on behalf of Legal, I consulted with her on this matter. Her</p>	<p>Altered accordingly</p> <p>A line has been added to the material considerations in the document to reflect this.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • P.7 – this should read parish council via their respective clerk (and not individual parish councillors). The parish council only has ‘one representation’. 	<p>response was as follows: <i>I think Cllr Watson may want the Council to list all of the material and non-material considerations in the SCI. Potentially something could be added to the effect that the list is not exhaustive and it is a matter of judgment.</i></p> <p><i>This document sets out how the Council will consult with the public. In any event this will need to comply with the regulations and NPG in order for any inspector to deem that the consultations undertaken to help formulate the plan were adequate.</i></p> <p><i>I think it is also necessary to be careful as any the Council must comply with the consultation requirements set out in the SCI at various stages of the local plan preparation and therefore this cannot be too onerous.</i></p> <p>P7 table gives information on the avenues of communication that will be used to keep people informed. This includes both Parish Councillors and Clerks.</p>	<p>No change</p>
--	---	---	------------------

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • P.8 – parish council agendas and minutes? Newsletters are good for general information on material and non-material considerations • P 11 – shouldn't this read parish council .. not parish councillor? • P 12 – please include full list of material and non-material information to reflect the changes in the new planning section of the Constitution + website information • P 14 – why not have Reg 14 and/or Reg 16 in the list? • Appendix 1 – isn't the yellow notice called a 'site notice'? <p>AONB Officers are not statutory consultees for planning so I thought they (and associated groups) would be referred to as public consultees/persons under areas of interest for community involvement in conservation areas?</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Refer to previous comment re constitution.</p> <p>None of the regulation numbers have been used, just the purpose of each stage.</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>Altered accordingly</p> <p>Web link to constitution web page added.</p> <p>No change</p> <p>Altered accordingly</p> <p>Added to list of public consultees</p>
Cllr Miln	<p>As it happens the Henley Business School at the University of Reading have just published for Civic Voice (the umbrella body for civic societies): 'Paper Tigers': a critical review of Statements of Community Involvement in England Resources High Street Task Force (highstreettaskforce.org.uk) which has lessons for us</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>No change</p>

	<p>such as the need for measurable standards for community involvement and principles for engagement (examples from other LPIs in the appendix) and consultation, eg Gunning. There is a sense that too many of them stem from a process rather than a results driven culture, and that deliberative, positive engagement that genuinely excites and fosters diversity needs to be more front-loaded.</p> <p>The document concludes with this thought:</p> <p><i>SCIs can become a far more useful and important tool in a future planning system. This work supports our conclusions made that system-wide approach to participation is required and that this needs to be supported by a culture change in planning offices that values participation, pursues community learning and is open to informed influence. Indeed, currently the NPPF makes no explicit mention of SCIs and government expectations for engagement remain vague, despite sustained claims to improve public access and transparency in planning. The current reform agenda set out in the 2020 PWP provides a clear opportunity to address such issues and improve community engagement across the system, with SCIs becoming an important hook to anchor meaningful participation.</i></p>		
--	---	--	--

<p>Cllr Stark</p>	<p>I think it would have helped me if I had had the changes from the previous SCI highlighted, unless they already are and I have missed how they are signified. Second, while I appreciate that this is a statutory documents and explains how the Council will engage with Communities, has it been seen by representatives of those at whom it is aimed? That said, I appreciate you have increased the number of different communication channels and that is welcomed.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Overall the review has meant minor changes to the document that was put out to public consultation in 2016 and then adopted January 2017. Therefore it was decided full public consultation was not necessary this time around.</p>	
-------------------	---	--	--