# Appendix 2: Summary of consultation responses received and Actions proposed.

# Planning Services: Statement of Community Involvement – Schedule of Responses and Recommendations for Actions

The consultation period lasted six weeks between 14 June and 24 July 2021. Consultations were sent, via email, to all district/borough councils with the County as well as the Peak District National Park Authority and Derby City Council. Consultations were also sent out to statutory planning consultees as well as all parish councils, elected County Councillors. Internal consultations with colleagues in other departments were also sent. A copy of the draft SCI was also placed on the 'Have Your Say' section of the Derbyshire County Council website, allowing members of the local community and other interested parties to comment.

12 organisations and individuals responded to the consultation. This includes one councillor, two local authorities, four parish or town councils and five organisations/statutory consultees. No comments/responses were received from members of the public.

## Amber Valley Borough Council

Responded to say they had no comments to make.

Actions: None

## **Bonsall Parish Council**

Responded with a general comment in respect of public consultation exercises, drawn from its experience with a current application for minerals development stating that '... there should be a duty upon the applicant in such cases to proactively consult with affected communities, and to assist communities in the consultation process and in understanding and measuring potential impact of proposed development'.

Actions: The comments of the Parish Council are noted. The purpose of the SCI is to set out the Council's approach to community involvement at all stages of the planning process e.g. plan making, determination of planning applications etc. The SCI encourages Whilst the County Council actively encourages applicants to undertake public consultation exercises with local communities prior to the submission of a planning application, there is currently no legal requirement for them to do so..

It is, however, acknowledged that information associated with mineral development (as well as other forms of development) can be overly technical.

The Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) regulations 2017 do go some way to resolving this issue by statutorily requiring the submission of a Non-technical Summary with any Environmental Statement.

## **Coal Authority**

Responded to say it had no comments.

Actions: None

#### Crich Parish Council

Responded to say it had no comments.

Actions: None

## Derbyshire County Council Elected member: Councillor Murphy (Masson Ward)

Responded to express support of the document, noting that community involvement is well catered for in Derbyshire under the SCI.

Actions: None

#### **Environment Agency**

Responded to say that it was a statutory consultee and provided up to date contact details. The Environment Agency also advised that it now charges for pre-application advice.

Actions: None

#### **Highways England**

Responded to say that it noted that Highways England had been listed as a statutory consultee in Appendices 1 and 2 of the SCI and also that Highways England would also encourage early engagement with statutory consultees during the pre-application stage.

Highways England also provided details of a document entitled '*The Strategic Road Network: Planning for the Future*' which is a guide to working with Highways England on planning matters, and requested that the Council guide applicants to this document at the earliest opportunity.

Actions: None in respect of the SCI. Officers have requested that the Highways England document be added to the Council's Local List of Validation requirements for Planning Applications.

#### Historic England

Responded to say it noted the content of the document and references to Historic England in Appendices 1 and 2. Historic had no further comments to make.

Actions: None

#### **Linton Parish Council**

Responded to say it had no comments.

Actions:

#### Matlock Town Council

Responded with the following comments 'The Council is concerned that the 'digital first' approach to consultations may exclude those in the community who do not have access to the internet, either because they cannot afford it, or because they are not confident with technology. It requests that other, more traditional means of consultation, still form part of the process to ensure it is inclusive and accessible to all those in the community'.

Actions: None. Tin addition to digital methods of consultation, the SCI proposes to retain the use of hard copies of documents during consultation exercises in respect of plan preparation and planning applications. In person 'dop-in' events and exhibitions are also proposed during local plan preparations.

#### North East Derbyshire District Council

Responded to say they had no comments to make on the content of the SCI. NEDDC also commented that its main offices could be used as a deposit location for consultations associated with new/replacement Minerals and Waste development plans.

Actions: None. The document currently proposes this approach for all District/Borough Councils.

#### **Natural England**

Responded to say that it couldn't comment in detail on the SCI but provided information in respect of the planning service it offered including advice on how to consult Natural England.

Actions: None.