

**Appendix 2 – Summary of Representations received during Statement of Community Involvement [SCI] consultation and the Council’s Response**

<b>Representor</b>	<b>Summary of Representation</b>	<b>Council’s Response</b>	<b>Amend SCI?</b>
Transport for London [TfL]	As a statutory consultee that is listed as a prescribed body under the Duty to Cooperate, we have concerns about the move towards requiring a standardised web form response for planning policy consultations and major planning applications. This often requires additional information to be entered repeatedly that may not be relevant for a statutory consultee. Use of a standardised web form also makes internal review and sign off and record keeping within the organisation more difficult because draft responses cannot easily be shared internally. We therefore request that the option of an emailed response is retained, at least for statutory consultees who are bound by the Duty to Cooperate.	The Council understands the position taken by the respondent. It will be at the discretion of the Planning Management Team to decide whether or not to accept email responses from certain statutory consultees for operational reasons.	No
Thorpe Ward Resident’s Association	Runnymede could adopt list of approved email addresses from organisations that are likely to comment on Planning application, i.e. Resident’s Associations. Any email from these addresses then would not need personal information entered and therefore would be able to go straight to the Boroughs Planning web site.	The Council will require respondents to utilise the webform wherever possible. There will be an option for uploading an attachment which will mean that organisations like Residents Associations could use a standardised form to return comments. A ‘Whitelist’ is unlikely to be established.	No
National Highways	In relation to paragraph 1.29 the proposal to send letters to Statutory Consultees should be used as a supplemental measure. The primary means of utilising email is both sufficient and efficient.  In relation to paragraphs 1.34 and 4.15 there would be a preference to retain the means of submitting their comments by email as this is considered to be more efficient to the organisation.	The Council understands the position taken by the respondent. It will be at the discretion of the Planning Management Team to decide whether or not to accept email responses from certain statutory consultees for operational reasons.	No
Private Individual	The retention of the ability to submit comments via the postal system is essential as removing this would	The planning team agree with this assertion which is why the decision to retain postal submissions was made.	No

	<p>exclude those who have limited ability to use computers, the internet and word processing.</p> <p>The forms should not be limiting in a way that it prohibits users from submitting comprehensive representations. In addition to this the form should be set so pre-drafted comments can be copied into the form effectively.</p> <p>The form should also allow the user to attachments (e.g. maps and images) with their representations.</p>	<p>Noted. A generous file size limit will be put in place to allow comprehensive representations to be made.</p> <p>These, on the whole, should be imbedded in the attached documents.</p>	No
Private Individual	<p>It is pleasing to note that it takes account of digitally excluded residents. Too often central and local government activities are aimed at those citizens that are 'digital natives'. To be all inclusive activities must allow for participation beyond social media and 'the web'.</p>	Noted.	No
Cllr Sam Jenkins	<p>Revised mechanisms should be suitable for those with protected characteristics and the Equalities Act. The webform should consider screenreaders and/or Alt Text.</p>	<p>The planning team will work with web services to ensure that the webform is suitable for all users.</p> <p>In exceptional circumstances where a resident has significant issues the planning management team have the discretion to utilise alternative methods.</p>	No
Elmbridge Borough Council	No Comments	Noted.	No
Private Individual	<p>The webform should allow for the consideration of large files to be attached. This may need to be done separately.</p> <p>Enable an auto-reply or read receipt as confirmation comments have been received.</p>	<p>Noted. A generous maximum file size will be permitted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>	No