

SPA Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) Consultation Report (July 2010)

Contents

1 Introduction	1
Background	1
2 Consultation	2
Pre-Consultation	2
Consultees	2
Summary of Responses	4
3 Compliance with Statement of Community Involvement	15

Contents

Introduction

1

1 Introduction

The purpose of this consultation statement is to demonstrate the consultation undertaken in preparing the SPD in accordance with Regulation 17 of the Town and Country (Local Development) (England) Regulations (as amended) and the councils adopted Statement of Community Involvement. The report shows who has been consulted in the preparation of the SPD and Sustainability Appraisal.

This Consultation Statement, together with the SPD and Sustainability Appraisal (SA) is also published on the Council's planning pages of it's website <http://www.rbwm.gov.uk>. For further information, please contact:

Planning Policy Manager
Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead
Planning and Development Unit
Town Hall
St Ives Road
Maidenhead
SL6 1RF
Tel: 01628 796115
Fax: 01628 796546

Email: planning.policy@rbwm.gov.uk

Background

1.1 The Thames Basin Heaths Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) is one of a number of planning documents, known as Local Development Documents, in the council's Local Development Framework (LDF), the folder of documents which are the main consideration in deciding planning applications.

1.2 The Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (SPA) is a network of heathlands designated for their internationally important heathland bird populations of Dartford warbler, nightjar and woodlark. It has been shown that recreational use of the heathlands can affect the bird populations.

1.3 The preparation of the SPD is to support existing policy and guidance on how to address the impacts of recreational disturbance arising from new residential development. It is being prepared in two stages. Part 1, which is associated with this consultation report, sets standards for how new residential developments will be expected to avoid and mitigate impact on the SPA. Following the adoption of Part 1, the council will undertake further work to establish projects and mechanisms towards which individual developments may contribute to on a proportional basis to avoid and mitigate their impact. When this work is complete Part 2 of the SPD will be prepared.

Consultation

2 Consultation

Pre-Consultation

Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report

2.1 In line with Section 19(5) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 the council is required to produce a Sustainability Appraisal (SA) on the sustainability of proposals in a Local Development Document. The council held initial consultation on the SA Scoping Report of this SPD over a five week consultation period between 16th November 2009 and 21st December 2009. Reports were sent out to Statutory Consultees⁽¹⁾ As well as to the RSPB and BBOWT (Berkshire, Buckinghamshire & Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust.)

2.2 During this stage of consultation on the SA Scoping Report, the council received responses from all of the consultees. The Main points raised were:

- The indicators associated with SA Objective 18 make no provision for assessing change to the historic environment
- SANGs could be used strategically to help reduce the risk of flooding if they are appropriately designed
- It will be important to ensure that the integrity of habitats and biodiversity of SANGs is also maintained
- Under SA Objective 17 there is nothing to assess whether the proposed SPA mitigation and avoidance measures are effective
- An Appropriate Assessment of the SPD should be undertaken

2.3 Amendments have been made to the Revised SA Scoping Report where it was considered appropriate to reflect these concerns. This in turn has helped to shape the Draft SPD.

Draft SPD and SA

2.4 The Draft SPD and accompanying Sustainability Appraisal Report were published for a 6-week period of consultation from 19th March to 30th April 2010.

2.5 Notifications of the publication of the consultation documents were sent to in excess of 74 statutory and local groups. A full list of those groups specifically invited to comment is set out in this report.

2.6 In addition to direct notification, copies of the consultation documents;

- Available to view in the council's receptions and libraries;
- Available to download from the council's website.

2.7 Public notices were placed in local newspapers to correspond to the start of the consultation and a press release issued.

2.8 51 Comments on the Draft SPD were submitted from respondents. Comments on the Draft SA Report were received from only 2 respondents. A summary of all comments and the outcome is provided in the following sections of this report.

Consultees

2.9 A full list of those organisations specifically invited to comment on the consultation draft SPD and accompanying SA Report is set out below:

A2 Housing Group

Amberleigh Homes Ltd

Annington Developments Ltd.

Ashill Developments

Banner Homes Group

Beacon Housing Association

Beaulieu Homes

¹ English Heritage, Environment Agency and Natural England.

Consultation

2

Bellway Homes (South East)
 Berks, Bucks & Oxon Wildlife Trust (BBOWT)
 Bewley Homes Plc
 Bracknell Forest Borough Council
 Bryant Homes
 Bucks County Council
 CALA Homes
 Charles Church Developments plc
 Chiltern Hundreds Housing Association
 Chobham Parish Council
 Colnbrook & Poyle Parish Council
 David Wilson Homes
 Dorney Parish Council
 English Heritage
 Environment Agency
 Eton Town Council
 Fairview New Homes plc
 George Wimpey West London Ltd.
 Government Office for the South East
 Hanover Housing Association
 Hedsor Parish Meeting
 Home Builders Federation (The)
 Housing Solutions Group / Maidenhead and District Housing Association
 Hurst Parish Council
 Joint Strategic Planning Unit (JSPU)
 Kings Oak Thames Valley
 Laing Homes
 Linden Homes
 Maidenhead and District Housing Association
 Maidenhead Civic Society
 Martin Grant Homes Ltd
 Millgate Homes

Natural England
 Nicholas King Homes
 Octagon Developments Ltd
 Old Windsor Parish Council
 Paradigm Housing Association
 Queensgate Homes
 Radian Group
 Reading Borough Council
 Redrow Homes
 Remenham Parish Council
 Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB)
 Runnymede Borough Council
 Ruscombe Parish Council
 Shanly Homes
 Slough Borough Council
 Society for the Protection of Ascot and Environs
 South Bucks District Council
 South East England Partnership Board
 South East England Regional Development Agency SEEDA
 Spelthorne Borough Council
 Sunningdale Parish Council
 Sunninghill & Ascot Parish Council
 Surrey County Council
 Surrey Heath Borough Council
 Taplow Parish Council
 Thames Valley Housing
 Toynbee Housing Association Ltd
 Trinity Residential Ltd
 Warden Housing Association
 Warfield Parish Council
 Wargrave Parish Council

Consultation

Wimpey Homes Holdings Ltd	Wokingham District Council
Windsor and Eton Society	Wycombe District Council
Table 1	

Summary of Responses

2.10 Through the consultation, stakeholders were given the opportunity to comment and make suggestions on the Draft SPD. The responses, their summary and the council's response are set out below:

Consultation

2

Ref	Name	Organisation	Section / Policy	View	Comment	Response
1	Ian Dunsford	Government Office For The South East	General	Comment	No specific comments other than to include "Part 1" on the title page of the document	Noted. Title page updated
2	Andy Stallan	Alliance Planning (on behalf of Berkeley Homes (Southern) Ltd	General	Object	This is a very restrictive policy as the SPD only provides a way forward for large sites that provide their own SANG and associated costs. It is questionable whether such large sites will come forward given the poor economic climate.	Noted, however the Council is working on a further strategy that will facilitate small scale developments that are unable to provide their own SANG solution. This will be issued as Part 2 of the current SPD.
3	Andy Stallan	Alliance Planning (on behalf of Berkeley Homes (Southern) Ltd	General	Object	Housing within RBWM tends to come from small development sites (under a hectare and up to 10 units). The SPD does not proactively make any provision for such sites in the mitigation strategy. SANG provision should be sought either within RBWM boundaries or if necessary outside of the borough. There should also be a specified timeframe for this work.	Noted. See above response. Negotiations are currently underway on a potential SANG, however these are currently ongoing and involve third parties. At present it is not possible to put a timeframe on their conclusion and the delivery of SANG.
4	Carrie Temple	RSPB	General	Comment	The use of the term "bespoke" may be confusing as it has become used primarily with larger scale developments where the mitigation proposed differs from that set out by NRM6 of the South East Plan. A more suitable term may be "developer provided SANGs"	Noted. Document updated to reflect this recommendation.
5	Carrie Temple	RSPB	General	Comment	The SPD should consider whether housing applications with developer provided SANG will also require individual Appropriate Assessment. Any requirement should be set out by the SPD.	Noted. Document updated to reflect this recommendation.
6	Carrie Temple	RSPB	2.2	Comment	To avoid confusion over the use of the terms "likely significant effect" and "adverse effect on integrity" the wording in this paragraph should be changed to reflect the specific wording in the Regulations.	Noted. Wording of document updated to reflect that used by the regulations.

Consultation

Ref	Name	Organisation	Section / Policy	View	Comment	Response
7	Carrie Temple	RSPB	9.3	Comment / Support	Support the reference to the need for SANG to be provided in perpetuity. It needs to be clear how this is to be achieved where the ownership of the SANG may be retained by the developer or another body.	The text of the document has been updated to indicate that the availability of the land in perpetuity must be clearly demonstrated.
8	Carrie Temple	RSPB	9.8	Comment	It needs to be clear that the minimum size for a SANG is 2 hectares.	Reference to the minimum acceptable size for a SANG is already set out by paragraph 9.7. No change required.
9	Carrie Temple	RSPB	10.1	Comment	Clarification should be provided to confirm that strategic access management proposals are for the SPA only and not SANGs	Noted. Text has been amended to make this clear.
10	Carrie Temple	RSPB	10.2	Comment	This section sets out key elements of the monitoring strategy, however monitoring of the habitat condition of the SPA will remain Natural England's duty and will not be funded by developer contributions. It is our understanding that strategic monitoring is not currently proposed to include visitor monitoring of the SANGs which will remain the responsibility of the local authorities.	Noted. Document updated.
11	Carrie Temple	RSPB	10.3	Comment	The footnote to this section relating to the strategic tariff should be updated to reflect recent legal advice commissioned by the TBH local authorities.	Noted. Document has been updated to reflect this.
12	Carrie Temple	RSPB	General	Comment	References to the Conservation (Natural Habitats etc) Regulations 1994 (as amended) should be updated to The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 which has recently been issued.	Noted. Draft SPD written prior to the new legislation coming into effect. References in the document have been updated to reflect the new legislation.
13	Catriona Riddell	South East England Partnership Board	4.1	Comment	It may be helpful to include direct reference to the relevant clauses of policy NRM6 of the South East Plan throughout the SPD. Also reference should be made to the fact that the Regional Strategy for the	Noted. No changes to document proposed.

Consultation

Ref	Name	Organisation	Section / Policy	View	Comment	Response
					South East has since 1 st April 2010 consisted of both the South East Plan and Regional Economic Strategy.	
14	Catriona Riddell	South East England Partnership Board	5.3	Comment	This paragraph could usefully explain that access management measures will be provided strategically and funded jointly by all affected authorities.	Noted. Document updated to aid clarity.
15	Catriona Riddell	South East England Partnership Board	6	Comment	It should be made clear that large scale developments within the zone of influence may be expected to provide bespoke mitigation that provides a combination of benefits	Noted. No change to text proposed.
16	Catriona Riddell	South East England Partnership Board	9	Comment	It would be useful to make reference to the potential for cross boundary working to deliver SANG.	Noted. This is not relevant for developer provided SANG covered by Part 1 of the SPD. No changes to the text are proposed.
17	John Woodhouse	Environment Agency	General	Comment	No particular concerns with the draft SPD and associated sustainability appraisal. The design and location of SANGS could be beneficial to flood risk if they are appropriately designed.	Noted. No change proposed.
18	Douglas Bond	Woolf Bond Planning (on behalf of Berkeley Homes Ltd)	General	Object	The SPD should acknowledge the existence of Ascot Heath, Windsor Great Park and Swinley Forest as legitimate SANGs to provide avoidance measure for residential development in this part of the borough.	These areas have not been agreed by Natural England as appropriate for use as SANG. No change to the text is proposed.
19	Richard Evans	Surrey County Council	General	Comment	We have no strategic planning concerns over the approach to the protection of the SPA	Noted.
20	Steve Williams	English Heritage	General	Comment	We have no specific matters that we wish to raise in respect of potential impacts upon the historic environment.	Noted.

Consultation

Ref	Name	Organisation	Section / Policy	View	Comment	Response
21	Rachel Martin	Berkshire, Buckinghamshire & Oxfordshire Wildlife Trusts	2.1	Comment	Reference to the Habitats regulations should be updated to reflect the change which came into effect on 1 st April 2010. Regulation 61 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 is now the relevant reference in footnote 1.	Noted. Draft SPD written prior to the new legislation coming into effect. References in document now updated.
22	Rachel Martin	Berkshire, Buckinghamshire & Oxfordshire Wildlife Trusts	Executive summary & 5.4	Comment	The SPD should explicitly state that until SANG has been identified and delivered contributions to the borough SANG cannot be accepted nor planning permission granted.	Noted. Text has been amended to make this clear.
23	Rachel Martin	Berkshire, Buckinghamshire & Oxfordshire Wildlife Trusts	2.2, 4.1, 5.3, 7.5, 8.3 & 9.1	Comment	Clarification required regarding the two separate legal tests from Regulation 61 of the new Habitats Regulations.	Noted. The text has been revised to reflect this point.
24	Rachel Martin	Berkshire, Buckinghamshire & Oxfordshire Wildlife Trusts	6.3	Comment	The reference to mitigation measures that may be required should include access management and monitoring as they form a package of measures that complement each other.	Noted. The text has been revised to reflect this point.
25	Rachel Martin	Berkshire, Buckinghamshire & Oxfordshire Wildlife Trusts	9.3 & 9.8	Comment	The reference relating to payment into the borough SANG should be removed as the SPD relates primarily to bespoke SANG provision. This will aid clarity. It needs to be clear that SANG should be fully operational in advance of dwelling occupation.	Noted. The text has been revised to reflect this point.
26	Rachel Martin	Berkshire, Buckinghamshire & Oxfordshire Wildlife Trusts	9.4	Comment	Reference should be made to ecological features which could be a factor in determining the capacity of a SANG.	Noted. Reference to key ecological features of a SANG that help to determine its capacity have been added to the text to aid clarity.
27	Marc Turner	Natural England	General	Comment	Natural England would like to see more information on how the Part 1 and Part 2 of the SPD will be merged and whether a similar level of consultation will occur for the second document.	Noted. Text has been updated to clarify how Part 1 & 2 will be merged. The development of Part 2 of the SPD will follow the same process of consultation as undertaken for Part 1. This is detailed in paragraph 10.2

Consultation

2

Ref	Name	Organisation	Section / Policy	View	Comment	Response
28	Marc Turner	Natural England	5.4	Comment	Paragraph 11.2 mentions that development will not be unlocked by this part 1 document on its own and that Part 2 will be required before applications can be considered to satisfy the Habitats Regulations. This should also be discussed in paragraph 5.4.	Noted. Text updated to clarify position.
29	Marc Turner	Natural England	6.1	Comment	South East Plan policy NRM6 states that large developments outside of the 5km zone could also have a significant effect upon the integrity of the SPA. Bespoke solutions for these developments needs to be agreed with Natural England. A reference to this should be added to the document.	Noted. Text has been updated to improve clarity.
30	Marc Turner	Natural England	7.3	Comment	The title of this paragraph should be re-worded as development that does not incur net increases in the number of dwellings could potentially go forward. We would prefer the 400m zone to be called a "zone of influence.	Noted. Paragraph has been updated to take account of schemes where there is no net increase. The title of the 400m zone has been altered for the purposes of clarity.
31	Marc Turner	Natural England	8.1	Comment	Policy NRM6 of the South East Plan states that any measures that will be used to mitigate the likely impacts of development on the SPA must be agreed with Natural England. A reference to this should be included in paragraph 8.1 of the SPD.	Noted. A reference in the text has been included.
32	Marc Turner	Natural England	9.2	Comment	A reference to the fact that bespoke solutions are discussed with Natural England should be added to this paragraph of the SPD.	Noted. A reference has been included in the text.
33	Marc Turner	Natural England	10.4	Comment	Natural England are pleased to see that RBWM are looking to adopt the Strategic Access Management tariff as soon as possible.	Noted.
34	Mark Carter	Carter Planning	Executive summary	Object	The document does not provide any guidance other than that already published by Natural England or the South East Plan and appears to be more negative and restrictive than the existing situation.	The draft SPD text combines in one place the requirements of policy NRM6 of the South East Plan together with guidance issued by Natural England and also

Consultation

Ref	Name	Organisation	Section / Policy	View	Comment	Response
					The document should be progress until SANG has been identified.	contained in the Thames Basin Heaths SPA Delivery Framework (February 2009). Combined, this represents a partial strategy, the remainder of which will be developed once a suitable area of land for SANG purposes has been identified and is capable of being delivered.
35	Mark Carter	Carter Planning	2.2	Object	The map does not indicate where the 0.27ha of SPA is located within the borough. The purposes of the zones and what may be permitted within them is not explained. The 5km to 7km zone has little significance since no major development will be located within the Green Belt. The zones should be qualified as Natural England work on travel distances and not simply zonal rings.	Natural England work on the basis of zonal rings and this approach has been set out by the South East Plan as well as the Thames Basin Heaths SPA Delivery Plan. The text of paragraph 2.2 has been updated to make clearer the significance of the different zone described.
36	Mark Carter	Carter Planning	3.1	Object	This document does not consider mitigation measures and SANG provision within other adjoining local authorities.	SANG located outside of the boundaries of RBWM do not form part of this strategy. No changes to the text are proposed.
37	Mark Carter	Carter Planning	4.1	Object	Before this paragraph it should be explained that the SPA stems from European legislation and the Habitats Regulations before explaining about the South East Plan.	Reference to the European legislation relating to the SPA is set out under paragraph 2.2, however a further reference has been added to paragraph 4.1 for the purposes of clarity.
38	Mark Carter	Carter Planning	5.2	Object	The SPD does not identify SANG which will be required to mitigate the impacts of development. It also does not identify areas which have been accepted by appeal Inspectors such as Ascot racecourse.	The purpose of the SPD is to provide guidance on developer provided SANG solutions. The document points out that currently no local authority provided SANG has been identified and delivered but once it has the SPD will be updated to reflect this. No changes are proposed.

Consultation

2

Ref	Name	Organisation	Section / Policy	View	Comment	Response
39	Mark Carter	Carter Planning	6.3	Object	It is hard to envisage a situation where any commercial development (lacking a residential component) will have an impact on the SPA. This proviso should be deleted.	Paragraph 6.3 picks up references in both the South East Plan and the Thames Basin Heaths SPA Delivery Plan to the fact that other type of non residential development may have some impact on the SPA and so may require assessment under the Habitats Regulations. No changes are proposed.
40	Mark Carter	Carter Planning	7.4	Object	Whilst it is accepted that 400m zone could be a linear distance Natural England normally advise that the 400m to 5km zone should be based on travel distance and not a linear route.	The advice set out by both the South East Plan and the Thames Basin Heaths SPA Delivery Plan specifically state that the zones are measured as a linear distance. No changes are proposed.
41	Mark Carter	Carter Planning	8.1	Object	This paragraph is not clear as developers can only provide a SANG they would not be able to contribute to the RBWM SANG as one has not yet been established.	The paragraph indicates that either a developer provided SANG may be provided or a developer contribution made towards a SANG provided by the Royal Borough (once one has been provided). Work is on going to identify a SANG that may be used to mitigate the impact of additional residential development. Once such SANG has been delivered the SPD will be updated to reflect this.
42	Mark Carter	Carter Planning	9.2	Object	Add to end of last sentence "when identified by the Royal Borough."	There is no system to allow for contributions to be made towards developer provided SANG. Developers could either provide a SANG to mitigate the impact of their development or once a Royal Borough SANG has been identified and delivered a developer contribution may be made towards that. No change to text of SPD proposed.

Consultation

Ref	Name	Organisation	Section / Policy	View	Comment	Response
43	Mark Carter	Carter Planning	9.8	Object	Add at end of last sentence "When identified by the Royal Borough."	Noted. The text has been updated to make it clear that contributions towards a local authority provided SANG can only be made once it has been identified and delivered.
44	Peter Standley	Society for the Protection of Ascot and Environs (SPAEE)	General	Support	The society supports the publication of guidance to provide developers and public with a framework for determining applications within 5km of the SPA	Noted.
45	Peter Standley	Society for the Protection of Ascot and Environs (SPAEE)	General	Comment	The guidance should provide information on how applications for additional dwellings will be dealt with until Part 2 of the SPD is published.	This is outlined in paragraph 1.2. Minor change to text made for the purposes of clarity.
46	Peter Standley	Society for the Protection of Ascot and Environs (SPAEE)	General	Comment	Part 1 of the SPD should be extended to cover in what circumstances mitigation can take the form of utilising a shortfall in the number of dwellings permitted within the 5km zone under an earlier permission. It should also cover the unacceptability of existing Crown Estate land to which the public are permitted as qualifying as SANG.	Noted. The main method of mitigation will be through the provision of SANG. Other forms of mitigation will be assessed on a case by case basis. No changes have been made to the document.
47	Peter Standley	Society for the Protection of Ascot and Environs (SPAEE)	Appendix C	Comment	The SANG guidelines produced by Natural England indicates that SANG should have guaranteed long term availability. We do not see how this squares with access to be in perpetuity. Long term availability has frequently been cited as a feature of Crown Estate land.	In order for SANG provision to be acceptable access to it must be guaranteed in "perpetuity" or in other words for an indefinite period. In the context of the Natural England advice "long term availability" should be taken to mean in "perpetuity". No change to the document has been made.
48	Peter Standley	Society for the Protection of Ascot and Environs (SPAEE)	7.1	Comment	In line 2 the phrase "dwellings" should be used instead of "houses". The protected birds should be described as "ground or near to ground nesting birds."	Noted. Text has been updated.

Ref	Name	Organisation	Section / Policy	View	Comment	Response
49	Peter Standley	Society for the Protection of Ascot and Environs (SPAEE)	9.2	Comment	This paragraph should be extended to indicate that until the SPD is updated and re-issued the guidance will apply to the determination of applications for additional dwellings within 5km of the SPA.	Once adopted the SPD will be a material consideration in the determination of planning applications. It is considered unnecessary to state this in the text and so no change to the text is proposed.
50	Peter Standley	Society for the Protection of Ascot and Environs (SPAEE)	9.4	Comment	This paragraph would benefit from greater emphasis on the need for any assessment of SANG Capacity to be undertaken by a competent body.	Noted. Text requires that capacity is discussed and agreed with RBWM and Natural England at an early stage. No further changes are considered necessary.
51	Peter Standley	Society for the Protection of Ascot and Environs (SPAEE)	9.8	Comment	This paragraph should say that account is taken of the relative distance of the application site from the SPA.	Proportionality of impact on the SPA based on the distance of the development from the boundary of the SPA does not form part of the strategy. However a degree of proportionality will exist in so far as the contributions for Strategic Access Management and Monitoring scheme which forms part of the strategy This will vary according to the number of bedrooms per dwelling. No change to text proposed.

Table 2 Summary of Responses to the Draft SPD

2.11 A number of changes have been made to the SPD as a result of the consultation, and can be seen within the adopted document.

2.12 In relation to the Draft SA Report, only Natural England and English Heritage responded to the document. A summary of these responses are included in Table 3 below, together with the council's response to these representations:

Organisation	Nature of Response	Summary of Representation	Council's Response
Natural England	Object	Concerned about the proposed monitoring regime (esp Table 4 of the Draft SA). It is unacceptable to state that SPD will be revised to make it 'less stringent'. NE do not consider it possible to make a policy less stringent without undermining the whole SPA approach.	Agree that the word 'stringent' is ambiguous. The wording of the monitoring indicators will be reworded in the Final Draft of the SA.

Consultation

Organisation	Nature of Response	Summary of Representation	Council's Response
		A number of other features could be monitored: 1) trends in the condition of the SSSI; 2) developer contributions taken towards upgrading SANG; 3) results of the strategic monitoring programme in terms of trends in visitors to the SPA itself and to the SANGs.	Monitoring comments are noted. In relation to 1) and 3) the Council is content to refer to the monitor the condition of the SPA, however all SPA monitoring data would of course be supplied by NE itself through the access management and monitoring approach as set out in the Draft SPD. In relation to 2), the monitoring of developer contributions is something which is undertaken, as a matter of course, by the council's S106 team. These 3 monitoring elements will be included in the revised SA report.
English Heritage	Support	Note that approach to mitigation and SANG provision is assessed as having a very positive effect on SA objectives including the protection and enhancement of the Borough's countryside, natural and historic environment; access to the countryside, and engagement in cultural activity. We have no specific matters that we wish to raise in respect of potential impacts upon the historic environment.	Noted.

Table 3 Summary of Responses to the Draft SA Report

Compliance with Statement of Community Involvement

3 Compliance with Statement of Community Involvement

3.1 The preparation of this SPD complies with the council's Statement of Community Involvement (SCI), adopted in June 2006. The SCI can be downloaded from the council's website. The table below summarises the SCI requirements and the actions which were undertaken.

Activity	Statutory Requirements for Community Involvement	Thames Basin Heaths SPA SPD (Part 1)	Additional Community Engagement	Thames Basin Heaths SPA SPD (Part 1)
Evidence Gathering	-	Consultation with statutory bodies, RSPB and BBOWT in relation to the scope of the Sustainability Appraisal for this SPD was undertaken between 16th November 2009 and 21st December 2009. Natural England, English Heritage, the Environment Agency, RSPB and BBOWT responded to the consultation and a revised scoping report and consultation statement were issued in March 2010.	-	-
Draft SPD	Make copies of the SPD documents and statement of SPD matters ⁽¹⁾ available in principal council offices	Yes	Make copies of the SPD documents and statement of SPD matters available in borough libraries	Yes
	Display SPD documents and notice of SPD matters on the internet	Yes	Issue a press release	Yes
	Send SPD documents and notice of SPD matters to specific and general consultation bodies	Yes	Place Site Notices	Not relevant for a topic-based SPD.
	Place a press notice covering SPD matters	Yes	Send Neighbour Notification Letters	Not relevant for a topic-based SPD.
			Public Display / Distribute a Leaflet	Not relevant for a topic-based SPD.
Adoption	Publicise adoption by: Displaying a statement of adoption on the internet	Yes	Issue a press release	Yes

Compliance with Statement of Community Involvement

Activity	Statutory Requirements for Community Involvement	Thames Basin Heaths SPA SPD (Part 1)	Additional Community Engagement	Thames Basin Heaths SPA SPD (Part 1)
	Sending notification to any body that has asked to be notified of adoption	Yes	-	-

- Note: 'SPD matters' – matters relating to the SPD including: the title; subject matter and area covered by the SPD; period within which representations on the proposals may be made; the address to which and (where appropriate) the person to whom representations must be sent; and a statement that any representations may be accompanied by a request to be notified at a specified address of the adoption of the SPD. 'SPD Documents' – includes the SPD; the sustainability appraisal report; the consultation statement and any relevant supporting documents.