

APPENDIX C

Committee: Cabinet
Date of Meeting: 19 October 2005
Report Title: Statement of Community Involvement (July 2005) - Regulation 26 Consultation and Proposed Changes

Summary of Main Issues and Proposals for Addressing Them

Introduction

From 446 organisations or individuals consulted, 46 responded (10%), with 151 representations. Of these 57 were in support, 17 objecting and 77 were objecting to an omission. All responses have been acknowledged.

Summary of Main Issues and Proposed Response

The overall response was positive, with a large number of constructive suggestions, the majority of which it is proposed to 'take on board' in amending the SCI. A significant number commented positively on the clarity of the document, although a few noted problems with the terminology of the new planning system and associated acronyms. The Government Office North West (GONW) comment favourably on the document, noting that it appears to comply with regulations and to meet the 'tests of soundness', but cautioning that it will be for the Planning Inspectorate to assess this in detail at the next stage, when the revised document is submitted to the Secretary of State.

The main issues raised and how it is proposed to address them is set below:

Main Issues	Proposals to Address Main Issues
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> textual corrections 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> all noted and corrections made
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> textual changes to clarify meaning or add information (eg to explain role of County Structure Plan) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> all changes accepted
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> additional strategies and plans requested to be taken into account (2.9) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> add all to SCI
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> additional consultees proposed, at Appendix C or D 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> clarify that some are already listed in Appendix D; otherwise add all, except for the suggestion to consult all business rate payers
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> several organisations provided 'standard generic responses' - including the National Playing Fields Association, British Wind Energy Association and Countryside Agency 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Seek to incorporate general advice and requirements where not already included in SCI
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> concern about formal style of representation form – in which consultees are asked to categorise their comments as 'objecting, 'supporting' or 'objecting to an omission' 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> agreed to consider this issue at future Reg 26 DPD consultations - but noting that the 'Submission to Secretary of State' stage will require consultees to respond in this formal way.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern about adequacy of resources to implement SCI; GONW also seek assessment of resource implications of more pro-active consultation methods. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> expand explanation of resources available, including Planning Delivery Grant; also expanding on resource implications of consultation methods.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern about consultation fatigue by public, given the number of LDF documents 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potential issue recognised; suggest selecting methods to maximise public

and consultation stages.	involvement at most significant stages
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In view of emphasis on 'front loading' of community engagement, that some site proposals will only emerge later in the process 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Give more emphasis to front loading and need to bring forward sites and proposals early in the process (and implications and potential costs of not doing so)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Explain approach to common consultation with other Council documents and where LDF documents will be consulted on together 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Explain that opportunities will be taken for common consultation; but that for LDF documents, it is only intended that the Site Allocation and Proposals Map DPDs be consulted on together.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Suggest extending beyond minimum consultation timescale 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Note that consultation periods may be extended where there are clear reasons and benefits
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Methods of engagement for 'hard to reach' groups 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Explain potential to use different methods to engage with these groups
Section 4 - Development Control	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Encourage pre application negotiations with English Heritage and Highways Agency 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> agree
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> issues related to public's right to view information on planning application files (and have free copies of information from them) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> clarify the public's right to view all information on planning files (including S.106 agreements and Environmental Assessments [EA]); noting that providing copies of applications or EAs would infringe copyright; and that the authority considers it reasonable to charge for copies.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Issues related to consultation with statutory consultees 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clarify that 'Technical Consultations' in table at para 4.13 includes all statutory consultees; but also list main statutory consultees in adjoining text
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Refer to role of ombudsman 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> agree
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> issues relating to requirement for developers to undertake community engagement prior to submitting 'major' or 'locally significant' applications 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> revise to note that applicants will have to demonstrate appropriate engagement and that the planning authority can advise on appropriate forms of engagement, but not offer a mediation role.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planning Committee site visits 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Explain present procedure
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> extending the development control consultation period to 28 days 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 21 days (7 more than the statutory minimum) is considered acceptable, in view of targets for making decisions.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Include information on judicial review and Environmental Law Foundation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Propose standard response forms 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site notices and neighbour notification letters considered adequate
Section 6 - Parish Plans	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Request for confirmation of potential role of Parish Plans as SPDs and for more SLDC resources to assist in their preparation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stress role of Parish Plans as part of the Community Strategy; and SLDC's willingness to consider the possibility of one joint SPD for all Parish Plans, once DPDs are complete.