

Summary of issues recommended to be included within proposed review

Current procedure	Reason for Review	options	recommendation
<p>Public speaking a site visits</p> <p>Currently objectors and applicant cannot speak, but Parish Council reps and Ward members under rule 24.1 can speak</p> <p><i>(Protocol para 4.6)</i></p>	<p>Public are not able to have say when they attend site visit. This has caused tension and dissatisfaction with process.</p> <p>24.1 speakers can raise issues but objectors/applicants cannot-this is seen as unfair</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. allow public speaking as before with one rep from each side , plus 24.1 speakers and Parish Council rep 2. allow public speaking as 1 but only if representative of applicant and objectors are in attendance 3. no public speaking but retain 24.1 right and Parish Councils 4. no public speaking and no 24.1 nor Parish Councils 	<p>2</p> <p>Reason: This allows public to point out issues on site. Seen to be fairer.</p>
<p>Notification of Members/Call in procedure</p> <p>The weekly list is the means by which Members are made aware of planning applications having been submitted.</p> <p>Also there is currently good dialogue between Members and staff on applications and as a result Members are more aware of the detail of applications</p>	<p>Weekly list is means of advising Members. This restricts call in to the original application and does not allow call-in on amendments.</p> <p>Weekly list can go out after neighbours have been notified-leaving Ward members unaware of application when contacted by public at an early stage</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Weekly list to have 3 week call-in time. 2. Individual letters to be sent to Ward Councillor within whose Ward the application site lies (at the same time as neighbours letters are sent). 3. Letters to go to Ward Members if 	<p>1-3</p> <p>Reason: Members will have same information as public; and also about amendments. Call-in period would not restrict processing of straightforward applications but would allow for extra call-in time when applications are amended.</p> <p>Maintain existing good level of dialogue between Officers and</p>

Summary of issues recommended to be included within proposed review

<p>and Officers have better understanding of the opinion of Ward Members.</p> <p><i>(Constitution: Responsibility for functions para 8.7 (iii)</i></p> <p><i>And Formalisation of Members call in procedure, agreed in 2004; annex ?)</i></p>	<p>Also 4 week period can cause delay in decisions being made for the majority of uncontroversial applications.</p> <p>The majority of controversial applications are discussed between Members and Officers at an early stage and call in occurs at an early stage</p>	<p>amended plans are received and in such cases extended call in period by 10-14 days depending upon nature of amendment.</p> <p>4. No change</p>	<p>Members early stage of process</p>
<p>Departures</p> <p>Currently any application that departs from Local Plan policy must be reported to Planning Committee and if accepted by PC must be referred to Council for decision</p> <p><i>(Constitution: Responsibility for functions para 8.7 and para 13 of Planning Protocol)</i></p>	<p>A number of uncontroversial applications including smaller applications typically where the site is not Previously developed land have been reported to the Committee and it is considered that this is unnecessary.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All departure applications decided by Planning Committee 2. Some departure applications be decided by Planning Committee (criteria based). 3. No change-Full Council consider all departures 	<p>1</p> <p>Reason Planning Committee is the expert committee to deal with planning matters.</p> <p><u>NB</u> The option currently exists for the Planning Committee to refer any application to Council. This option would remain and relates to all applications not only departures.</p> <p>Planning Committee would decide, before item is introduced, if it wishes to refer any application to Council for decision to avoid unnecessary debate/public speaking</p>
<p>Non material changes Prior to Committee</p>	<p>This is considered to be restrictive and overly</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No change 2. Allow verbal 	<p>2</p> <p>Reason:</p>

Summary of issues recommended to be included within proposed review

<p>Currently the Protocol states that no minor change to an application shall be considered at committee unless it has been published in the agenda for the relevant meeting.</p> <p><i>(Para 14 of Planning Protocol)</i></p> <p>Non material changes Following the grant of planning permission</p> <p>In the past significant alterations to applications have been agreed by Officers as “minor amendments”</p> <p>This practice ceased some time ago.</p>	<p>administrative.</p> <p>Concern is raised that in the past significant changes have been agreed without public and ward member knowledge. Also the legality of such agreements is questionable.</p> <p>Government are about to introduce changes which allow for a formal procedure for agreeing amendments to existing planning permission</p>	<p>update of minor changes to applications to be considered by committee</p> <p>Maintain current position that significant changes to existing planning permissions are not granted.</p> <p>Await changes to regulations which will set procedure for dealing with such matters.</p>	<p>Reflects reality of planning process</p> <p><u>NB</u> Planning Officer to liaise with Chairman of PC to agree whether an amendment is “minor”</p> <p>Government intends to introduce regulations in October 2009 setting out procedure for agreeing amendments and is anticipated to involve an application procedure for approving non-material amendments to an existing planning permission. The working Group will be verbally updated of the new procedures at the meeting.</p>
---	---	--	---