



Appendix 1

**Summary of Comments Raised on the Council's Revised Statement of
Community Involvement 2018**

Name of Respondent	Response Made on Statement of Community Involvement	Actions Required to Amend the Statement of Community Involvement
Historic England	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No comment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No action required.
LCC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Throughout the process of the emerging Local Plan, The School Planning has been consulted with at the various stages requiring a formal response regarding education including each regulation stage. Formal face to face meetings with planning officers and attending group that includes district planning officers from border districts and e-mail/telephone exchanges have been entered into, sharing information have been welcomed by School Planning. The face to face meetings have enabled us the opportunity to provide up to date information of the education provision across the district. We have been able to discuss in detail emerging issues i.e. school expansion/closure, migration, financial/land contributions and any strategies to mitigate the impact. The School Planning Team appreciate the involvement and opportunity to respond and exchange information, supporting Rossendale Borough Council to achieve the next stages of the local plan adoption. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comments made have been noted. No action required.
Natural England	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No comment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No action required
Private Individual	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rossendale Council’s consultation process has failed to adequately consult with residents affected by proposed development set out in the local plan; independent inspector is asked to consider if the council has met its statutory legal requirement in its duty to consult and if the council should be forced to begin this process again. It is [the respondent’s] opinion that the council have breached the following principles: “Consultations should be clear and concise”: Documents associated with the consultation contain jargon and acronyms which many consultees may not understand and some documents are over 50 pages long; The Council has made no effort to ensure documents are easy to follow or are understandable to those who are not familiar with the details of planning system / local plan process; no consideration has been made to those who do not speak English as a first language or those with learning difficulties. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The comments raised do not suggest making any amendments to the Statement of Community Involvement, therefore no action is required. However, the comments raised do apply to the Council’s consultation process and its failure to adhere to the methods set out in the SCI or the inadequate application of them. Therefore, the comments made will be

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Consultations should have a purpose” The Council have failed to respond to consultation as they have retained sites in the Local Plan, despite objections being raised against these sites in previous stages in the preparation of the local plan. • “Consultations should be informative” Information provided is not sufficiently detailed as to enable consultees to understand proposals and make meaningful representations on them. In order to comment, the respondent has had to read several other documents, including the draft Local Plan which is too complex and specialised, as well as other evidence documents such as the Green Belt review, AMR and so on. • “Consultations should be targeted” At a meeting at Haslingden Library on 19/09/17, it was confirmed that the Local Plan consultation had been publicised via an article in the Rossendale Free Press, through a Facebook post and on the Council’s website. As well as having failings in themselves, these methods fall significantly short of a targeted consultation and, rather, the Council has tried to consult as few people as possible. The other consultation methods quoted in the SCI (e.g. posts on twitter, leafleting, one to one meetings, letters to individuals etc.) have not been employed. When questioned why residents affected by proposals were not written to directly, attendants at the meeting were told that this was an ineffective method. However the respondent questions the evidence to support this assumption. The timing and location of public meetings has also been raised as an issue – in relation to the time of day that meetings were held (4-7pm was felt to exclude those who worked), meetings should have been spread out (i.e. meetings should not have been held in the same week) to ensure more opportunity to attend and the location of meetings meant that those reliant on public transport would not be able to attend. • “Conducting a fair consultation” Despite being a resident who would be directly affected by the local plan (i.e. a proposed site will surround their property), the respondent had no knowledge of the proposals until they were informed of them by a neighbour. The respondent feels that the council had a duty to notify those that are affected. 	<p>raised as key issues.</p>
Private Individual	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paragraph 1.2 does not take account of the publication of the revised National 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All comments have been

	<p>Planning Policy Guidance in July 2018.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Also in Paragraph 1.2 the General Data Protection Regulation is incorrectly shown in the plural.• Paragraphs 1.3 and 2.3 contain confusing references to Neighbourhood Forums. The bodies that are referred to here have, I understand, already been renamed.• Likewise, the reference to Area forums in Table C is confusing.• The definition of Neighbourhood Forum in the Glossary is obsolete and confusing. Neighbourhood Forum as per the Localism Act 2011 should be defined, as should the bodies formerly described by the Council as Neighbourhood Forums.• "What is it?" in Table A Stage 3 is misleading. The Council must send all comments (or copies) to PINS at the time of submission for examination.• Footnotes identifying statutory instruments should also quote their number. The GDPR should have a footnote showing its EU number.	<p>noted and the necessary amendments have been made to the Statement of Community Involvement.</p>
--	--	---