

Respondent	Representation Number:	Summary of Main Issues raised and changes sought	Proposed response / changes
Peter Sargeant Cont.	SCI/05/O/03	Considers that the SCI fails the 3 <sup>rd</sup> and 9 <sup>th</sup> Test of Soundness and objects to Section 4 and 6 and Appendix G.	
		Raises the point that, the Ward and Township maps in Appendix G are diagrammatic and do not cover areas outside of the Wigan Borough. As such Mr Sargeant considers that they are of little assistance to those who do not know which ward they live in and for understanding which bodies might have influence or be subject of consultation beyond the Wigan boundary.	No change. The ward maps and township maps are diagrammatic and for illustration purposes only. Ward and parish boundaries for adjacent Authority areas are not covered within Wigan's SCI as they are covered by that Authority in their respective documents and websites.
	SCI/05/O/04	Considers that the SCI fails the 4 <sup>th</sup> , 5 <sup>th</sup> and 6 <sup>th</sup> Test of Soundness and objects to Section 5, Tables 1 and 2.	
		Considers that the Council Tax mailing is a valuable and appropriate means of reaching the resident population and others with interests in Wigan at a negligible cost and feels that methods currently used have not had a 'startling' effect.	No change. The primary purpose of Council Tax mailing is to 'request' payment and advise on how money is spent. It is by no means an ideal medium to promote involvement of the LDF; it has minimal graphics and It has to be light in order to keep the cost of postage to a minimum. The Borough Life Magazine on the other hand, is considered to be an effective method to use as this is delivered to all residents in the Borough and generates a lot of interest. As such, the SCI will continue to commit the Council to using this method and not the Council Tax mailing as suggested. The community engagement database is a continuous and evolving database.

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Representation Number:</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issues raised and changes sought</b>	<b>Proposed response / changes</b>
Peter Sargeant Cont.	SCI/05/O/05	Considers that the SCI fails the 5 <sup>th</sup> Test of Soundness and objects to Section 5, Tables 1 and 2.	
		Considers that it is inappropriate and misleading to include the Readers Panel in Tables 1 and 2, given the absence of clarification of its spread in the community.	The Readers Panel is representative of the borough as it is a sub-section of the Citizens Panel and includes a good cross section of reading ability across the Borough. To avoid further confusion, a change is proposed to add the following wording to Table 1 under the heading 'Readers Panel': 'The panel is a sub-section of the Citizens Panel and is representative of the borough'.
	SCI/05/O/06	Considers that the SCI fails the 7 <sup>th</sup> Test of Soundness and objects to Section 7.	
		Remains unclear how views will be analysed and weighted and what means will be used to provide proper feedback. Feels that the onus is on respondents to chase for information.	No change. Section 7 is clear in stating that all comments made will be fully considered at pre-production and production stage and that at the submission stage those comments made on the Soundness of the SCI will be considered at examination. It is also clear that a summary of the main issues raised and an explanation of how these have been addressed will be provided as a means of good practice.

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Representation Number:</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issues raised and changes sought</b>	<b>Proposed response / changes</b>
Peter Sargeant Cont.	SCI/05/O/07	Considers that the SCI fails the 9 <sup>th</sup> Test of Soundness and objects to Section 8.	
		Considers that significant locally-determined rules concerning decision-making are entirely hidden in one or other Supporting Document relating to Planning Applications.	No change. The supporting documents 'Publicity for Planning Applications' and 'Considerations of Planning Applications at Planning Committee' clearly identify the decision making process. The decision making process is also reinforced in the standard letters informing interested parties that applications are going to Planning Committee. To avoid any doubt, the SCI clearly states in paragraph 8.23 that details of current delegated powers for deciding planning applications can be obtained from the Development Control Administration Team. The supporting documents should be read alongside the SCI for detailed and evolving information.
	SCI/05/O/08	Considers that the SCI fails the 9 <sup>th</sup> Test of Soundness and objects to Section 8.	
		Considers that cross-boundary matters are not dealt with adequately in the SCI and hopes that this can be dealt with.	No change. The Council cannot control what neighbouring Authorities do with planning applications received in their area.  However, to clarify the Councils position in relation to cross boundary matters for planning applications received within Wigan Borough, we propose to add the following wording to the end of paragraph 8.19 in the SCI. 'If the Council receives a Planning Application on the Borough boundary or in close proximity to the boundary it will carry out publicity arrangements with nearby properties as though they were located within the Borough and representations received will be taken into consideration in the normal way'.

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Representation Number:</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issues raised and changes sought</b>	<b>Proposed response / changes</b>
Peter Sargeant Cont.	SCI/05/O/09	Considers that the SCI fails the 9 <sup>th</sup> Test of Soundness and objects to Section 8.	
		Raises the issue that, the SCI does not identify which newspapers it will use for Development Control purposes. Considers that people should know which newspapers will be used to give publicity of major commercial and housing schemes so that out-of-Wigan interested parties can know how best to monitor what is going on.	Agree. Change proposed to paragraph 8.19 to indicate which papers the Council will use and the following wording is proposed: ‘for example, a planning application affecting the west of the Borough will normally be advertised in both the Wigan Reporter and the Wigan Observer, and a planning application affecting the east of the Borough will normally be advertised in both the Leigh Reporter and the Leigh Journal.’
	SCI/05/O/10	Considers that the SCI fails the 9 <sup>th</sup> Test of Soundness and objects to Section 8.	
		Is unconvinced that the Council is taking into account the problems that can arise through lack of thought about the setting of deadlines and holiday periods for consultation reflected in the SCI.	No change. Planning Applications have to be dealt with within a Statutory period, within which no attitude is given for holiday periods. The Council normally gives 24 days for representations to be made on Planning Applications (for those notified). This is in excess of Statutory requirements and is considered sufficient.

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Representation Number:</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issues raised and changes sought</b>	<b>Proposed response / changes</b>
Peter Sargeant Cont.	SCI/05/O/11	Considers that the SCI fails the 9 <sup>th</sup> Test of Soundness and objects to Section 8.	No change. Paragraph 8.23 and 8.24 of the SCI clearly summarises the decision making process and how applications get to Planning Committee, it points the reader to contact the Development Control Administration Team of the current delegated powers for deciding planning applications. Indeed the decision making process is clearly detailed in both the supporting documents 'Publicity for Planning Applications' and 'Considerations of Planning Applications at Planning Committee' and these documents should be read alongside the SCI for detailed and evolving information. Development Control is a dynamically evolving process and flexibility is needed in the SCI to reflect this. It's content in this respect is considered appropriate and sufficient.  Propose a change be made to paragraph 8.21 to include the following wording at the end of that paragraph: 'so that they can play their part in the decision making process'.
		Considers that there is no satisfactory explanation of how applications get to Planning Committee and the role of Councillors in that regard (see new 8.23).	
	SCI/05/O/12	Considers that the SCI fails the 9 <sup>th</sup> Test of Soundness and objects to Section 8.	No change. The supporting document 'Publicity for Planning Applications' has been updated (January 2006) in line with the SCI.
	Is of the opinion that there are contradictions between the supporting documents for development control and section 8, for example, concerning the provision of decision notices and considers that this has been made worse by paragraph 8.27.		

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Representation Number:</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issues raised and changes sought</b>	<b>Proposed response / changes</b>
Peter Sargeant Cont.	SCI/05/O/12 Cont.	2) Mr Sargeant raises the following new issues: Raises the point that paragraph 8.6 refers incorrectly to a following page.	Agree. Change proposed to paragraph 8.6 to replace the words 'on the next page' with the word 'below'.
	SCI/05/O/13	Considers that the SCI fails the 4 <sup>th</sup> , 5 <sup>th</sup> , 6 <sup>th</sup> and 7 <sup>th</sup> Test of Soundness and objects to paragraph 6.9. Is of the opinion that paragraph 6.9 introduces an onerous responsibility on members of the public when making representations, without explaining how ordinary people might be expected to fulfil it.	No change. The wording is taken from Paragraph 4.17 of PPS12.
	SCI/05/O/14	Considers that the SCI fails the 5 <sup>th</sup> and 9 <sup>th</sup> Test of Soundness and objects to paragraph 8.2. Raises the point that there is an inconsistency between paragraph 5.1 which states 'inform' 'consult' 'participate' and paragraph 8.2 which reads 'inform' 'consult' 'involve'.	Agree. Change paragraph 8.2 to be consistent with paragraph 5.1 and read 'participate' instead of 'involve'.
	SCI/05/O/15	Considers that the SCI fails the 9 <sup>th</sup> Test of Soundness and objects to paragraph 8.19. Expresses that paragraph 8.19 appears to be an incomplete recital and misleading regarding statutory periods for press notices compared with its supporting documents.	Change proposed to paragraph 8.19. Delete the last two bullet points of paragraph 8.19 and replace them with the following three bullet points for consistency with the supporting document 'Publicity for Planning Applications' (January 2006). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Development affecting the setting of a listed building.</li> <li>▪ Development affecting the character or appearance of a conservation area.</li> <li>▪ Application for listed building consent.</li> </ul>

Respondent	Representation Number:	Summary of Main Issues raised and changes sought	Proposed response / changes
Sport England North West	SCI/06/O/01	Considers that the SCI fails the 4 <sup>th</sup> Test of Soundness and objects to Appendix D and paragraph 4.4.	
		<p>In relation to Appendix D and paragraph 4.4 respectively Sport England North West is concerned that groups who are to be consulted are not readily identifiable. They state that whilst paragraph 4.4 refers to 7 groups they consider that Appendix D has 9 subheadings.</p> <p>Considers that Chapter 4 would need a corresponding amendment as per the above suggestions.</p>	<p>No change. Appendix D has only 7 broad group headings which indicate examples and groups of bodies we propose to involve in consistency with paragraph 4.4. However, there may be confusion with differentiating between the two main categories of consultees and the 7 broad group headings within these. The 2 categories of consultees will be highlighted in bold or larger text to differentiate between these and the 7 broad group headings.</p>
		<p>Considers that Appendix D should contain more clarity on the groups to be involved and that it would be useful and informative if the 'other consultees' as listed in E3 of Annex E PPS12 were described in Appendix D (which includes Sports England).</p>	<p>No change. The list of contacts in Appendix D is not definitive but indicative. It is a variation on annex E, PPS12 to relate local circumstances and be user friendly. It consists of broad groups of bodies which incorporate the consultees listed in E3 of annex E, PPS12. Sport England comes under the umbrella of 'Sports and Recreation Organisations' in Appendix D and are consulted as a key body under that heading. It is not appropriate to attempt to list every organisation.</p>

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Representation Number:</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issues raised and changes sought</b>	<b>Proposed response / changes</b>
Sport England Cont.	SCI/06/O/02	Does not specify a specific Test of Soundness but:	No change. The Council has a statutory obligation to provide Best Value which includes using resources prudently.
		raises concerns in relation to paragraph 9.5 as it refers to 'prudent use of resources' and paragraph 8.20 'that statutory consultees will be notified and consulted on planning applications'.	
		<p>Sport England wishes the SCI to explicitly state that consultation with Statutory Consultees will be fully resourced with adequate information to enable full and proper consultation to be performed, enabling such committees to discharge their statutory role.</p> <p>They request that, receipt of information is to be in a form required by the consultee and to extend to receipt of copy decision notices.</p>	The Council encourages applicants to submit properly prepared and well informed planning applications to assist statutory consultees in responding to these. Unfortunately, the success of this is limited by the willingness of the applicant to co-operate. Decision notices are available on the Council's website and will be sent to consultees on request.
Brian R Wilson Ashton-in-Makerfield	SCI/07/S/01	Generally supports the SCI.	Support welcomed
North West Regional Assembly	SCI/08/S/01	Supports Section 2, paragraph 2.1 to 2.5, and figure 2.	Support welcomed
Bellway Homes Ltd	SCI/09/S/01	Supports Section 8, paragraph 8.2 to 8.17.	Support welcomed
NW Planning Aid	SCI/10/S/01	Supports Section 11, paragraph 11.1 to 11.4.	Support welcomed
National Playing Fields	SCI/11/I/01	Provides information on how they wish to be directly consulted.	Information and support welcomed