

Appendix Showing Appraisal of Customer Comments Received

Consultee	Comments Raised	Officer Response to Comments
Miller Homes	<p>Welcome the opportunity to comment although advise that additional costs will not be welcomed. However if they help secure an improved service in respect to discharge of conditions this will help soften the blow.</p> <p>Concerned monies have to be paid 'up front' at the time request is made. Experience has shown this means lower priority is given to condition discharge issues by many Authorities, leading to lengthy delays. Consider payment should be due on receipt of Local Authority response letter, which would help incentivise Local Authorities to prioritise workloads.</p> <p>Central Government should introduce a National Performance Indicator for the time taken to respond to condition discharge requests, to speed up responses</p>	<p>Effective performance management of service will ensure high level of service</p> <p>Government advice is clear that fee has to be paid up front. As such there is no discretion to vary timescale for payment.</p> <p>Decision for Central Government therefore no discretion. However it should be noted that this Council has established Local Performance Indicators to monitor efficiency of this area of the service</p>
PH Architectural Partnership	<p>Welcome the opportunity; advising that some Authorities have implemented the charges without prior notification, a course of action which has lead to difficulties in explaining additional costs to clients</p> <p>Advise many clients consider the Government's stated aim of trying to improve the planning service is merely masking increased charges 'through the back door'.</p> <p>Administration of the new charges will merely lead to additional costs and delays to Planning Authorities, which in turn will lead to further delays in the system</p> <p>Rather than introduce a separate fee charge for conditions the initial</p>	<p>Noted however Central Government decision.</p> <p>Officers are confident that the Planning Team has capacity to administer new charges without leading to any such delays.</p> <p>Noted, however Central Government</p>

	<p>planning application fee should be increased. This would avoid architects having to request additional fees from clients</p> <p>The fees are discriminatory on the grounds that there is no initial application fee for disabled persons applications, yet there would now be a fee payable to discharge any conditions attached to any such approval.</p> <p>Many Authorities presently apply numerous conditions to planning permission. As such there is a fear this approach will continue to ensure additional income generation.</p>	<p>decision.</p> <p>In recognition of this comment Officers propose to waive the fee requirement for disabled persons</p> <p>Officers will ensure that all planning conditions meet the relevant statutory test, including that they are necessary in order to allow the development to proceed.</p>
Phil George Architect	<p>Raises concerns as to how the proposed fee will impact on smaller clients</p> <p>Many Authorities presently attach ambiguous conditions to approvals which in many cases replicate detail already submitted with the original planning application. Request that if charging proposal are adopted, that care is taken to ensure such conditions are not attached to approvals, in order to ensure that unnecessary expense is not incurred in discharging their requirements</p>	<p>Fee scale is nationally set. However, as discussed in the main body of the report there is evidence to shown that planning fees are a very small percentage of overall development costs.</p> <p>Officers will ensure that all planning conditions meet the relevant statutory test, including that they are necessary in order to allow the development to proceed and also that they do not duplicate detail already submitted with the original application.</p>
Jeff Park Architect	<p>The proposed fees add more red tape to the statutory planning process. Further charges would be unacceptable to clients.</p>	<p>As per comment above proposed fees are considered to represent a small percentage of overall development costs. In addition Officers are confident that processes can be carried out in a timely manner in order to prevent 'red tape' delays.</p>