

## **Growth, Infrastructure and Resources Scrutiny Committee Meeting: 13 August**

### **Deputation from Mrs S Walling**

It is clear that the process of consultation on the Statement of Community Involvement has been challenged in a number of ways, Gunning Principles and Government Code of Practice are mentioned, yet the view of the Cabinet, Officers and the Monitoring Officer is that the process was carried out PROPERLY, FAIRLY and PROPORTIONATELY.

In light of RCC's claims I give an example for consideration as the issue of leading questions seems to have been overlooked and whether the responses to these questions demonstrate effectiveness.

In the preamble to question 3 it refers to appendices 1, 2 and 3, yet the question asks if RCC should follow government advice in respect to provisions to Local Plan documents. This is not only a leading question, alone a matter for serious consideration by scrutiny, but also the wording of the question discouraged any response in relation to appendices 2 and 3. Only appendix 1 is entitled Local Plan Documents.

Only those people with the confidence to challenge RCCs response to Government advice and say No to question 3 were then given the chance to make suggested modifications to appendices 1,2 and 3 in question 3A..

The Statement of Community Consultation was ineffective, unfair and unreasonable. Each and every aspect needs to be fully debated by scrutiny and I suggest requires the sign off by all councillors before adoption.