

APPENDIX 2: DRAFT REVISED STATEMENT OF COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT (SCI) 2016 CONSULTATION RESPONSES TABLE

RESPONSE ID	RESPONDENT ID	SUPPORTING/ OBJECTING/ MAKING A COMMENT	COMMENT	CBC RESPONSE & PROPOSED CHANGE
SCI001	279	Making a comment	<p>Can you ensure that any documents that go out for consultation via email or the website be done as a Word document as well as a PDF document. The CDF Deputy Chairman is blind and her computer reads to her but will not read PDF files. Can you ensure the alternative is put on the website for others with the same problem across Copeland.</p> <p>One of our Copeland Disability Forum (CDF) members has read the document and asked why Copeland Disability Forum are not listed as a Statutory Consultee? CBC has an SLA with CDF to provide consultation responses. Can you ensure we are added to the Statutory Consultees.</p>	<p><u>CBC response</u></p> <p>The CBC Planning Policy Team uploaded a Word and PDF version of the Draft Revised SCI 2016 consultation document as soon as this email request was picked up on Monday 15th April 2016. Both versions of the document were also emailed to the consultee.</p> <p>With reference to statutory consultees, the Planning Policy team has chosen to use the definition and lists of organisations as appears in Part 1 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 which outlines a national standard for consultation bodies defined under 'Specific'; 'Statutory and Government'; 'Non-Statutory'; and 'General'.</p> <p>Each of these categories in the Draft Revised SCI list those organisations that the legislation lists and, for the purposes of that legislation and clarification, CDF would fall into 'General' (p40 of the Draft Revised SCI) and as "Bodies which represent the interests of disabled persons in the local planning authority's area".</p> <p>The team has chosen not to list specific non-statutory and general bodies within the Draft Revised SCI as this</p>

RESPONSE ID	RESPONDENT ID	SUPPORTING/ OBJECTING/ MAKING A COMMENT	COMMENT	CBC RESPONSE & PROPOSED CHANGE
				<p>list would be extremely extensive and would continuously evolve over time meaning that the document would become dated virtually as soon as it is published. It can be confirmed however, that CDF are indeed on our LDF database of consultees to be notified of all Local Plan documents being consulted on.</p> <p><u>Proposed change</u> To add wording to chapter 3 under 'Consultation bodies' reminding the reader that organisations are listed as examples are provided and therefore the list is not exhaustive.</p> <p>Wording to be added to section 'Local Plans Consultation – How to consult?' under bullet point... "Place all documentation and supporting information on the Council's website (www.copeland.gov.uk) with details of where and when the documents are available to be inspected." With..."Documents will be uploaded in both Microsoft Word and PDF formats to make it easier for some members of the community who have sight difficulties or are blind to enable Microsoft Word or PDF to read the document back to them;" (page 17).</p>
SCI002	280	Support	Thank you for your consultation on the above dated 15 April 2016 which was received by Natural England on 15 April 2016.	<p><u>CBC response</u> Representation comments accepted.</p> <p><u>Proposed change</u> No change required.</p>

RESPONSE ID	RESPONDENT ID	SUPPORTING/ OBJECTING/ MAKING A COMMENT	COMMENT	CBC RESPONSE & PROPOSED CHANGE
			<p>Natural England is a non-departmental public body. Our statutory purpose is to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development.</p> <p>We are supportive of the principle of meaningful and early engagement of the general community, community organisations and statutory bodies in local planning matters, both in terms of shaping policy and participating in the process of determining planning applications.</p> <p>However, we have no specific comments to make on this consultation.</p>	
SCI003	281	Support/No comment	<p>Many thanks for inviting us to comment on your consultation draft Statement of Community Involvement 2016.</p> <p>We welcome references to Barrow Borough Council and relevant parishes within our Local Planning Authority as organisations that Copeland Borough Council should work with and consult in respect of the Duty to Co-operate and wider consultations activities, however on this occasion, we have no specific comments to make on this consultation.</p>	<p><u>CBC response</u> Representation comments accepted.</p> <p><u>Proposed change</u> No change required.</p>

RESPONSE ID	RESPONDENT ID	SUPPORTING/ OBJECTING/ MAKING A COMMENT	COMMENT	CBC RESPONSE & PROPOSED CHANGE
SCI004	268	Making a comment	Page 15, Local Plans Consultation – Who to consult? Perhaps give details about who to contact or how to be added to the Local Plan consultation list.	<u>CBC response</u> Noted and agreed. <u>Proposed change</u> Information will be added to this ‘Who to consult’ section of the report about who to contact for those who wish to be added to the Local Plan consultation list.
SCI005	268	Making a comment	Page 41, Appendix 3 For most people looking at the SCI this is likely to be the item of most interest, so should it be incorporated into the main report rather than being in the Appendix?	<u>CBC response</u> Noted and agreed. <u>Proposed change</u> The detail of appendix 3 to be moved into the content of the main report.
SCI006	282	Supporting/ Making a comment	The Lake District Area Ramblers Association welcomes the opportunities to comment particularly on planning applications with a wider rural content that affect use of the countryside by its members (appendix 2).	<u>CBC response</u> Representation comments accepted. The Lake District Ramblers Association will be added onto the LDF database and contact details sent through to the Development Management team. <u>Proposed change</u> No change required.
SCI007	283	Making a comment	Thank you for your consultation received in relation to the Copeland SCI. Please note that British Waterways were replaced by the Canal and River Trust in 2012. The Canal & River Trust is a statutory consultee under the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure)	<u>CBC response</u> Noted and agreed. <u>Proposed change</u> Any reference to British Waterways within the SCI will be replaced with the Canal and River Trust. The LDF database will also be updated to reflect this.

RESPONSE ID	RESPONDENT ID	SUPPORTING/ OBJECTING/ MAKING A COMMENT	COMMENT	CBC RESPONSE & PROPOSED CHANGE
			<p>(England) Order 2015. As such please update your database and replace the reference to British Waterways with the Canal and River Trust at Appendix 2 on page 39 of the SCI</p> <p>Apart from that the Canal and River Trust do not have any further comments to make on the SCI.</p>	
SCI008	39	Making a comment	<p>The revision of the SCI is both necessary and welcome. Overall it is considered to be well written, it provides suitable practical advice and the web-links to relevant documents and to further advice are useful.</p> <p>However, it is considered that the document would benefit from the addition of paragraph numbering in order to assist future cross-referencing – it would also have assisted the preparation of this response.</p>	<p><u>CBC response</u> Noted and agreed.</p> <p><u>Proposed change</u> Paragraph numbering will be added to assist future cross-referencing.</p>
SCI009	39	Making a comment	<p>Page 15 – Section on “Who to Consult”- Usually the use of a consultee database, as in Copeland, works well and in our experience results in timely notifications and responses. However, the Trust is always wary in sentences such as “A database of Local Plan contacts: used to consult on the preparation of Local Plan documents where appropriate” of the words “where appropriate”. In our experience on occasions Planning Authorities are unaware of the extent of our interests, e.g. in</p>	<p><u>CBC response</u> This usually applied to individuals who may have responded to a particular consultation on proposals close to their property, and would be added to the database but not wish to be consulted on matters elsewhere in the Borough. However, the comment is noted and agreed.</p> <p><u>Proposed change</u> Who to consult – Copeland Borough Council do notify all contacts on the consultation database on each Local Plan</p>

RESPONSE ID	RESPONDENT ID	SUPPORTING/OBJECTING/MAKING A COMMENT	COMMENT	CBC RESPONSE & PROPOSED CHANGE
			<p>environmental education, or our contributions to the health agenda, and as a consequence some important opportunities to add value to planning policy documents have been missed. Given the ease of consultation by email it is suggested that the default approach should be to send notifications of new consultations to all those on the database unless they have previously indicated that they do not wish to be consulted upon certain types of documents. (A general notice in a local newspaper is unlikely to provide an adequate backstop for the circumstances described above [although it is beneficial in reaching other local groups and individuals].) The same concern applies to wording such as “along with all relevant contacts” as used in Appendix 3 – the contacts themselves are usually best placed to determine which documents are relevant to them.</p>	<p>document that is consulted on and as such the wording “<i>where appropriate</i>” will be removed.</p> <p>The wording “<i>along with all relevant contacts</i>” in field ‘direct notification via letter or email’ will be removed and replaced with “<i>along with all other consultees</i>”. Appendix 3 will be relocated into the main body of the report.</p>
SCI010	39	Making a comment	<p>Page 26 – the first two paragraphs (starting “The Planning Inspectorate will then consider the appeal”) appear to be out of place and should be moved into the following section headed “Planning Appeals”.</p>	<p><u>CBC response</u> Noted and agreed.</p> <p><u>Proposed change</u> The paragraph in question will be relocated to page 26 as a separate paragraph.</p>

RESPONSE ID	RESPONDENT ID	SUPPORTING/OBJECTING/MAKING A COMMENT	COMMENT	CBC RESPONSE & PROPOSED CHANGE
SCI011	39	Making a comment	<p>Pages 27-28 – the section on Enforcement is a useful one to include. However, we would suggest that it is a little lacking in terms of the “community involvement” advice. If there is an Enforcement Charter in place then the matter can be remedied by a cross reference to this and including the appropriate web-link. If that is not the case then it would be useful to supplement this section to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If there is a formal complaint form that can be used • What information will assist the Enforcement Officer in pursuing an investigation • How/when the complainant will be kept informed about progress with, and completion of, the investigation 	<p><u>CBC response</u> Noted and agreed.</p> <p><u>Proposed change</u> A link to the Council’s Planning Enforcement Manual will be included in this section along with details of how customers can make a complaint, what information should be gathered, to whom the information should be relayed and how the customer will be kept informed of the outcome and/or any action taken.</p>
SCI012	39	Making a comment	<p>Appendix 4 – whilst we do have Listed Building and Advertisement <u>Consents</u>; at the moment outline, full, reserved matters and householder applications are seeking Planning <u>Permission</u> (as per the Glossary).</p>	<p>The wording “consent” has been replaced with “permission” for full, reserved matters and householder applications.</p>
SCI013	13	Support/No comment	<p>Thank you for consulting us on the above part of the Local Plan which we received on the 20 April 2016.</p> <p>On this occasion we have no comment to make on this document.</p>	<p><u>CBC Response</u> Representation comment accepted.</p> <p><u>Proposed change</u> No change required.</p>

RESPONSE ID	RESPONDENT ID	SUPPORTING/OBJECTING/MAKING A COMMENT	COMMENT	CBC RESPONSE & PROPOSED CHANGE
SCI014	284	Making a comment	<p>Page 22 – “The Council will place copies of applications and accompanying plans for anyone to view, on deposit, at the Market Hall in Whitehaven. Copies of applications relating to the South Copeland area will also be available for inspection at the Council Centre in Millom”.</p> <p>(What about adding the web site and Mod Gov)?</p>	<p><u>CBC response</u></p> <p>The weekly list notifying the public of new planning applications is available to view on the Council’s website but the planning applications themselves are currently not available to view or download from the website. Page 25 of the SCI states that the Council will be (to be amended to “the Council is”) moving towards making planning applications available to view and download from our website. There is no timescale as to when this is likely to go ahead as yet.</p> <p><u>Proposed change</u></p> <p>A brief paragraph highlighting ModernGov will be added within the resources section under chapter 5 ‘sources of information’.</p>
SCI015	284	Making a comment	<p>Page 23 – “Any consultation required by direction: where there are further, locally specific, statutory consultation requirements e.g.:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Copeland Disability Forum; (Does this include South Copeland Disability Forum)? ▪ Cumbria County Council e.g. Highways matters. 	<p><u>CBC response</u></p> <p>Page 23 of the SCI mentions those statutory consultation bodies that Development Management engage with when seeking views on individual planning applications. Copeland Disability Forum and Cumbria County Council are mentioned as examples of bodies and, as such, this list is not exhaustive. This type of statutory consultation body would also include South Copeland Disability Forum for applications relating to the south of the Borough.</p> <p><u>Proposed change</u></p> <p>The two bodies mentioned represent examples of statutory consultation bodies and not a complete list.</p>

RESPONSE ID	RESPONDENT ID	SUPPORTING/ OBJECTING/ MAKING A COMMENT	COMMENT	CBC RESPONSE & PROPOSED CHANGE
				Nonetheless, South Copeland Disability Forum will be added to the list of examples which will support the existence of the two different Forums.
SCI016	284	Making a comment	Page 24 – “Comments should be made within 21 days of the date of validation of the planning applications. This timescale increases to 28 days for major planning applications. All comments must be made in writing either by my (I think this should be "by") email development.control@copeland.gov.uk or letter posted or hand delivered to:...”	<p><u>CBC response</u> Noted and agreed.</p> <p><u>Proposed change</u> The word “my” to be replaced with the word “by”.</p>
SCI017	284	Making a comment	Page 25 – “The Council will be (Should this not be "is moving") moving towards a more efficient and environmentally friendly way of working by uploading all planning applications and associated information online yet, until this new way of working is in place, members of the public can contact the Development Management team direct for any other enquiries about planning decisions using email development.control@copeland.gov.uk or telephone 01946 598422/598514”.	<p><u>CBC response</u> Noted and agreed.</p> <p><u>Proposed change</u> The words “will be” to be replaced with the word “is”.</p>
SCI018	284	Making a comment	Page 42 - Neighbourhood Forums “There are ten Neighbourhood Forum meetings in the Copeland Borough. This network is set up and serviced by Cumbria County Council. It	<p><u>CBC response</u> Noted and agreed. This detail has been confirmed by Area Neighbourhood Officers at Cumbria County Council as correct.</p>

RESPONSE ID	RESPONDENT ID	SUPPORTING/ OBJECTING/ MAKING A COMMENT	COMMENT	CBC RESPONSE & PROPOSED CHANGE
			provides an opportunity for local residents to informally debate and discuss local issues and help influence priorities. The Council will attend Neighbourhood Forum meetings when appropriate to discuss and debate local issues. All Local Plan documents” (has CCC been contacted about this? At the moment the County are not using Neighbourhood Forums)	<u>Proposed change</u> To remove all reference to Neighbourhood Forums within the Revised SCI 206.