

Questions for GIR Scrutiny 11.06.20: Statement of Community Involvement

1. The SCI should be reviewed every 5 years. This means RCC's should have been reviewed in 2019. This fact is not made clear in the report which implies this review is a result of changes needed in relation to Covid 19. It is imperative we have an up to date SCI, and one which from its adoption will last for 5 years; albeit with future potential amendments to reflect the ongoing Covid situation. Can it be made explicit, for the benefit of the public during consultation, that this is the SCI 5 year review?

Para 1.2 makes it clear that the "review the Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) (is) in order to encompass statutory changes to planning regulations for policy making, neighbourhood planning and development management and to allow national guidance in relation to Covid 19 to be incorporated into the SCI."

It is accepted that the report could have stated that the SCI must be reviewed every 5 years.

This however does not necessarily mean that it will last for 5 years as there is scope to review the SCI at any time within that 5 year period.

2. Ref. paragraph 3.4. Regardless of Government guidance should we not be saying we will also use social media and advise parish councils and parish meetings?

Yes, we have planned to use these measures and so they could and should have been included in the summary set out in this paragraph. These are however clearly set out in Table 1 Consultation Methods in the Draft SCI Review document.

3. SCI (page 29 of the report). Why has the deleted part in paragraph 1.9 been deleted?

It was deleted to improve the clarity of the document but can be retained if desired.

4. SCI (page 35 of the report paragraph 2.6). Why is the Council not reviewing its CIL charging schedule which is now four and a half years old?

There is no legal requirement to review the CIL on a 5 year basis. The most appropriate time to do this will be after the Local Plan is adopted as infrastructure requirements and viability considerations, which are key to the review of the charging schedule, will be determined by the policies and proposals in the adopted plan and the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan.

5. SCI (page 39 para 3.8). I have been unable to find the statement of common ground. Should this paragraph not have a link to it?

Statements of Common Ground form part of the Duty to co-operate and are usually agreed in the period between Regulation 19 consultation and Examination hearings. This is because the relevant bodies need to be able to consider the content of the Pre-submission Local Plan in order to respond to the consultation and then confirm areas of common ground. As Duty to Co-operate (DtC) work is

ongoing and iterative, draft SoCG have been prepared with our DtC partners, they will not be signed until after the Regulation 19 consultation when they will be finalised for submission of the plan for consideration at its examination. As such, they are not published at present. A Statement of Compliance with the DtC will also be prepared to support the submission of the plan. A summary of this statement will be published as part of the Regulation 19 consultation.

6. SCI (page 42 para 3.31). I find this paragraph vague. It refers to “proactively” engaging with those who are shielding but does not indicate how this will happen. Will the Council, for example, write to each of them?

It is our intention to write to all those on the shielding list, however the use of this information for this purpose is subject to GDPR. Discussions are ongoing as to how we can use the information we hold to engage these people in the consultation. They will be advised that if they wish to engage in the consultation to contact the planning policy team by phone so that we can determine the best way to meet their individual needs and ensure their involvement in the consultation.

7. SCI (page 43 para 4.1 (and in other places)). Why remove the libraries as depositories of planning documentation? The SCI should last 5 years and libraries will again be open within that time. Could we not simply have “and libraries when open to the public”?

There is no requirement for the SCI to last for 5 years and the Council can review at any time. It is important that the SCI sets out what the minimum requirements are. We will do more than the minimum where this is feasible and practical. Table 1 of the SCI sets out a whole range of methods of consultation which will be used in addition to the “minimum requirement”, this includes using the libraries when it is appropriate to do so. It is our intention to use libraries as soon as it is safe to use them as deposit points, however this is not simply about them re-opening – if we are to use them as deposit points we will need to employ strict contamination prevention methods. This includes having sufficient numbers of copies to allow them to be appropriately decontaminated between use and ensuring appropriate social distancing measures can be achieved. Following Covid-19, it is intended to undertake a review of the SCI.

8. SCI (page 45. “Engage with existing relevant partnerships, forums and groups”). Should we not simply stop at “groups” without giving any examples in order to ensure longevity of the document? The Rutland Water Partnership, I believe, is not actually meeting at the moment so could not be a consultee at this stage.

It is best to identify general consultation bodies in the SCI where possible. This list is not meant to be exhaustive and it will be at the discretion of the group whether these choose to meet. However, if it is considered preferable then we can amend as suggested in the question.

9. SCI (pages 46/47). Why is the old paragraph 4.7 removed? It was far more informative of what might be found in the appendix than the replacement 4.7?

Happy to keep the old paragraph and update to refer to Appendix 7.

10. SCI (pages 48/49 planning applications). As people who are shielding won't see planning application notices affixed to lampposts etc. could we not have a para stating that when advising parish councils of planning applications we will encourage them to draw these to the attention of any residents whom they feel would want to know but are shielding?

Yes we could do this, we do also write to those adjacent to the site so they should get a letter if they are adjacent to a site.

11. SCI (page 51 para 5.22) Rutland CC has changed its procedures regarding deputations etc. does this paragraph not need updating?

The statement in the SCI is still accurate, it is just the process that has changed. It is possible to do this to any meeting of Council just using a different method.

12. SCI Appendix 1 (pages 54/55). In the section on Regulation 18 reference needs to be made to location of plans if libraries are not open (see question 7 above). Indeed, would it not be simpler to have an overarching section at the beginning saying during the restrictions imposed by Covid we will.... which in turn will modify what comes after. This would then mean that in the following parts of this Appendix subsequent Regulation consultations would still have the option of copies being made available in libraries. Whilst it is highly unlikely libraries could be utilised for Regulation 19 consultation they may well be available for subsequent parts of the process. Should we not be including libraries where possible to facilitate public engagement with this process?

The approach taken is to specify the minimum requirements whilst giving flexibility to extend beyond these if circumstances allow.

See answer to question 7 above.