

Responses received to consultation on Medway Statement of Community Involvement 2019

Consultee	Consultee comment	Medway Council response
Natural England	Support, but state that unable to comment in detail, on individual Statements of Community Involvement.	No change required.
Historic England	General support and promote involvement of heritage stakeholders in consultation.	No change required.
	Provided note on Consultation with the Heritage Sector, which outlined general principles that HE suggested be reflected in the SCI.	For Local Plan purposes we consult Historic England as a statutory consultee. For development in a historic setting our conservation team consult accordingly. General principles used in processes of Planning Service, and included in council guidance on neighbourhood plans. Text updated at para 2.12.
Gravesham Borough Council	Diagram outlining plan preparation process - The period for consultation under Regulation 18 should be included in the same way as it is for the Regulations 17 and 19 period for consultation.	Information is reproduced from national Planning Practice Guidance. The consultation period for Regulation 18 is clarified in the text.
	The possibility of asking an Inspector to recommend main modifications as part of the examination process is included. It should be made clear that this would require a further period of public consultation and the length of time such consultation would take. It would also require a sustainability appraisal;	Information is reproduced from national Planning Practice Guidance. The requirements for consultation on main modifications are outlined in the table at para 2.5.
	Given that community involvement consists of more than consultation, it should be made clear that the Regulations allow for interested parties to be kept informed of the relevant stages of the plan-making process;	The details of the key stages are included in the SCI with links to the regulations. Further information on communications and engagement, including outside formal consultation stages has been provided in the plan making section.

	Under “publication and submission”, there is no need to include a reference to Regulation 21 as the local plan does not apply to London.	This has been clarified in text.
	The second item in the table on page 8 refers to a 6 week period of consultation under Regulation 19. This is, in fact, a period for making representations to be considered by the Secretary of State rather than the Council and hence it is not a period for consultation. This is correctly noted in the key stages on page 7.	This has been clarified in text.
	The table on page 8 has omitted the period of consultation which would be required should any main modification be proposed.	This has been clarified in text.
	In paragraph 2.7, the Council should give a firm commitment to giving forward notice of key consultations and events rather than “where possible”. In the absence of forward notice, could the process be open to a legal challenge?	This has been clarified in text.
	On page 9, a key stage diagram for Neighbourhood Plans should be included as has been done for the Local Plan on page 7	This has been provided.
	It is not clear from the table on pages 13 and 14, that all paper copies of documents as well as leaflets and summaries of documents will be available both in libraries and at Council offices.	This has been clarified in text.
	The publication of public notices in the press should be included in the table. If the Council engages in face to face meetings with interested parties during periods of public consultation, this should be included in the table.	Public notices have been included in table. Text has been updated to refer to workshops, events and meetings.
	Reference in paragraph 2.37 to a service privacy statement should either be moved forward and included in paragraph 2.27, where the first reference is made to contact details, or paragraph 2.27 should include a cross reference to paragraph 2.37.	Noted and amendment made.

	Attendance at Council/committee meetings is a form of involvement, consequently reference should be made in paragraph 2.29 to such public attendance (and participation if relevant) and include advice on where to find details of dates, times and venues.	Elected member attendance at Council meetings is covered in this paragraph and signposts people to the council's website for further information.
	In the table on page 23, neighbours and the wider community are included as stakeholders for development affecting the setting of a listed building but not for listed building consent. Shouldn't these be consistent? Whilst the wider community has been excluded under listed building consent, heritage groups (which could be defined as part of the wider community) have been included under "additional publicity". A further inconsistency occurs in the absence of heritage groups when considering the settings affecting a listed building.	Comment noted - this table has been revised following advice from the Development Management team in the Planning Service.
	In the table on page 25, "loss of views" is listed as a non-material consideration. Does this require some qualification limiting it to personal views from a person's property? Public views of a heritage asset would be considered as a material consideration.	The text has been amended for clarity.
Southern Water	Page 9: Neighbourhood Plans - For the sake of clarity and to reflect the requirements of Regulation 14 (b) of the Town and Country Planning (Neighbourhood Planning) (England) Regulations 2012, paragraph 2.12 of this section should be amended to include reference to the 'consultation bodies' that should be consulted as a requirement of Regulation 14(b).	Text has been updated at para 2.12 and links provided to the PPG for consistency and clarity.
	Given that planning decisions will be made in accordance with Neighbourhood Plans, it is considered that it would be of assistance to those involved in the process to have a section	Text has been updated at para 2.12 and links provided to the PPG for consistency and clarity.

	detailing the pre-submission consultation and publicity process. Again, we would look for a commitment to consult consultation bodies, such as Southern Water.	
	"Page 17: How information is used and reported - The Council's response to individual representations made during the planning policy making process is beneficial to Southern Water as it helps us to understand the Council's position and gives us the opportunity to clarify any misunderstandings before a document reaches the submission stage. Therefore, the commitment to provide summaries of the main issues and how these were taken into account in terms of Development Plan Documents and Supplementary Planning Documents is welcomed.	Noted - this is made available on our webpage.
	Page 23: Publicity on Planning Applications - Whilst not a statutory consultee on planning applications, it is important that Southern Water is consulted on major applications that may impact on the provision of water and/or wastewater services to existing customers, for example, if the proposed development affects access to or the efficient operation of Southern Water's infrastructure. Accordingly, it is suggested that 'relevant service providers' could be included in the 'Stakeholders' column with regard to Major Applications.	The table has been revised as it was noted that the list was not comprehensive and is therefore potentially misleading. For clarity and certainty, a link to consultees defined in planning legislation and guidance is provided in the appendix.
Kent County Council	Support - no comments to make	No change required.
Port of London Authority	Support - no comments to make	No change required.
Member of public	Comment that local Parish Council not aware of training delivered on Neighbourhood Planning.	SCI revised to note that council will respond to requests for further information on neighbourhood planning.