

## INFORMAL AGENTS MEETING

TUESDAY 3 MARCH 2015

### MINUTES

Present: Chris Parsons  
Adrian Parker  
Shaun Gayton  
Gareth Mower  
Mike Hastings  
Peter Gidney

Stuart Ashworth (BCKLWN)  
Lee Osler (BCKLWN)  
Ruth Redding (BCKLWN)  
Rebecca Bush (BCKLWN)  
Jo Watson (CSNN – BCKLWN)

#### 1. APOLOGIES

John Maxey, Graham Seaton and Daniel Wallage

#### 2. MINUTES FROM PREVIOUS MEETING – 8 September 2015

##### Highways

CP hasn't had an opportunity to speak to highways.

##### Electronic Decisions

RR to speak to LO.

##### Conditions

(SA) conditions could be headed by subject on some majors, but slitting pre-commencement conditions from two part conditions is likely to cause confusion.

(CP) some conditions are not worded very well and you have to read the condition in full to see if it is a pre-commencement condition.

##### Portal

(LO) informed the group that the Planning Portal has been taken over by Teraquest, who have confirmed that they will not be charging applicants/agents or the LPA for the service.

##### Decisions

(SA) Some LPA's take a risk-based approach when they re-issue decisions, as technically they don't have the power to do this.

**Action: (SA) to take Legal View on the re-issue of Decisions.**

#### 3. CSNN

(CP) welcomed Jo Watson from CSNN to the meeting. He outlined one concern regarding comments made on planning applications, by CSNN which are covered by other legislation.

(JW) explained that her section's main function is to enforce nuisance issues regarding noise, fly tipping and dust etc. Planning responses are often late as they are not their priority. The aim of the section is to design out complaints and she explained that the team are always happy to meet agents on site to discuss proposals. She also explained that all officers are qualified in acoustics.

(PG) ASHP (Air Source Heat Pumps) have details on the drawings and when CSNN raise an issue, he is unsure of who to contact. He suggested some guidelines for ASHP's would be helpful.

(JW) explained that they cannot give guidelines for noise levels as each case can be different depending on background noise.

(CP) at design stage a specific product has not been chosen.

(MH) stated that the client often changes their mind and a different produce may be installed to that specified on the drawing.

(JW) said that she understood the issues but they need to know the product is not going to cause noise nuisance.

(SG) asked if CSNN have standard conditions

(JW) said that they do and she will arrange for them to be distributed.

**Action: JW to circulate standard conditions.**

(AP) asked if it would be appropriate to word the condition to say that the ambient level should be between x and y.

(JW) answered that they could word a condition to specify a maximum level of, for example, 55db but in some circumstances, this would still not be acceptable.

(CP) agreed with AP in that this would be a more workable solution.

(JW) said that she would need to discuss this with her colleagues.

**Action: JW to contact Agents regarding a standard condition with a 'maximum' db stated.**

(AP) asked why CSNN ask for drainage details, when drainage is covered by Building Control?

(MH) said that this has improved and in his experience is not happening as much.

(JW) said that it is sometimes necessary to condition foul and surface water.

(CP) stated that CSNN are asking questions at the Planning Stage which will be answered at Building Control stage and as a result, planning applications are being front loaded. He also suggested that if agents experience inaccuracies in CSNN comments, they contact the relevant planning officer. He went on to say that it is difficult with regard to ASHP's to give specifics at design stage. There are no problems showing the position of it on the planning application, but the noise level is unknown at the design stage.

#### **4. Extension of Time Requests**

(PG) suggested that the use of EOT letters is being abused and that the planners are using them to cover leave etc.

(SA) said he would look into this.

General consensus around the table was that they were useful and were much more preferable to having an application refused or withdrawn.

**Action: SA to speak to David Taylor about the particular case**

#### **5. CIL**

*To Follow*

#### **6. LDF Update**

*To Follow*

#### **7. NCC Parking**

(SA) informed the group that NCC Design Guide is under way, but the Parking Standards are on hold.

#### **8. Five Year Land Supply**

(AP) would like a statement as to why applications are being decided on allocations and yet developers are being asked to wait adoption of the site allocations? *To Follow*

(SA) explained that the Council are challenging the Fosters appeal decision at the High Court.

#### **9. S106 Agreements & Affordable Housing**

(SA) informed the Agents that a guidance note and FAQ's are being placed on the Council's website, following the changes. This would also be emailed to agents direct.

#### **10. AOB**

(SG) asked what are the current flood map that agents should be using?

(SA) confirmed that the SFRA are the current maps. And that Tidal Hazard Mapping are being updated and should be published by the Environment Agency in June / July 2015.

(CP) informed the group that the Hazard mapping for Fenland has been published on Fenland DC's website.

#### **Action: RR to invite the Environment Agency to the next Formal Agents Group**

(SA) said that SUDS processes are being implemented and we will keep the Agents informed as progress is made.

#### Next Meetings

Formal Agents Meeting 23 June 2015 at 3pm – Venue to be confirmed

Informal Agents Meeting 8 September 2015 – 3pm – Venue to be confirmed.