INFORMAL AGENTS MEETING

8 SEPTEMBER 2014

Present: Adrian Parker Lee Osler (BCKLWN)

Shaun Gayton Stuart Ashworth
Grahame Seaton Peter Gidney
Grahame Seaton Gareth Mower

David Taylor John Maxey (Nominated Chair)

Ruth Redding

1. Apologies

Chris Parsons (Chair) Mike Hastings Daniel Wallage

2. Minutes of Previous Meeting

Highways

(GS) asked if there were any updates from Matt Tracy about garage sizes?

(SA) stated that we were awaiting confirmation but were getting "mixed messages" – he has pressed Highways for a view as we need something definitive. Garage sizes only become an issue though when the garage counts as a parking space.

(GM) said that, generally, he receives a good service from Highways.

(JM) asked if the Highway conditions have been reviewed?

(SA) informed the group that Chris Parsons had agreed to assist Matt Tracy with this work at the Highway meeting in May. Stuart also stated that Highways are in the process of reviewing the manuals.

Highways Email Address: developer.services@norfolk.gov.uk

Electronic Decisions

(RR) said that further discussions need to be had, as she has concerns about sending out decision notices electronically, as invalid letters which are sent out electronically are often not received by the Agent.

VAT Receipts

(RR) informed members that VAT receipts for Pre-Application Advice are now being issued.

Extension of Time

(SA) confirmed that we can ask for an extension on minor and other applications.

Discharge of Conditions

- (AP) said that with regard to two-part conditions they are not like Building Control Completions, where a site visit is required.
- (SA) stated that if the development is not checked that it has been built in accordance with details submitted, we cannot take Enforcement Action.
- (GS) asked if the wording of the conditions can be amended?
- (SA) said that they are based on Chief Planners letter but will have another look.
- (JM) asked if the conditions on decision notices could be split into Pre-Commencement, Pre-Completion and Pre-Occupation etc. conditions.
- (SA) said that he would look into it.

3. LDF Update

To Follow.

4. Protcol for the Group

- (PG) has been approached by three agents who have asked why the Chair of the Informal Group has been in post for so long and suggested that a new Chair should be elected annually.
- (AP) said that he agreed in principle and said that the current Chair does a fine job but when a new Chair is elected it should be done at the Formal Agents Meeting. He thought annually was too frequent to change the Chair and perhaps every two-years would be better.
- (SA) said that we will place it on the Agenda for the next Formal Agents Meeting.
- (GS) asked if the three agents who approached PG attend the formal group?
- (JM) suggested there may be scope for additional members, but agents not always forthcoming to join group. He suggested that a Vice-Chair should be elected as well.
- (PG) said the issue about speaking at Planning Committee has never been resolved and that we should revisit this and other subjects that need further discussion.
- (SA) said that he had visited Breckland Planning Committee but the Chair needs to speak to the Chair of Planning Committee for KLBC.
- (PG) stressed that not being able to answer questions at Planning Committee is frustrating.
- (GS) asked what conclusion this discussion has drawn.
- (SA) said that the Chair will need to have a discussion, as above.
- (JM) said that he was sure that the Chair has it in hand.

5. Design Guide

- (PG) said that some planners often don't like design and he is asked to change the design, but isn't given any specifics.
- (JM) agreed that planners need to be specific if they want the design changed.
- (SA) agreed.
- (PG) said he finds it alarming what he sees in Conservation Areas, i.e. plastic guttering, car park signs etc.
- (SA) said that our Conservation Officer has been conditioning some of these items and that we no longer have design guides.

Some discussion followed giving bad and good examples of development in Conservation Areas and the advantages and disadvantages of having Design Guides

6. **New Operator for Planning Portal**

- (LO) said that he had received an email in July. CLG have decided to move the Portal away from Government control. Bids to run the Portal are in and the new operator may run it differently. There may be a nominal fee for applicants to use the Portal, but it will give the new operator more commercial freedom.
- (JM) said that he thought if the Portal started charging, Agents will start emailing applications instead of using the Portal. He asked if there were any timescale for this.
- (LO) responses to say there were no timescales at present.
- (SG) asked if there is any information on the Portal on this?
- (GM) asked if there could be more than one supplier.
- (LO) said that he didn't know at this stage.

7. Fees for Prior Notification Application

(RR) said that the fee regulations have been updated to introduce a fee for Prior Notification applications for change of use. See SI 2026/2014.

8. Any Other Business

GS

Asked that when typing errors appear on decision notices, can we not just re-issue the decision, instead of asking for S73 application. He said that in his experience Breckland just re-issue the decision.

(SA) said that we have no powers to amend a decision once it had been issued. Only Planning Inspectors have the power to do this.

(SA) said he will get a legal view.

SA

Informed members of two new documents:-

(i) Technical Consultation – July 2014.

www.gov.uk/government/consultations/technical-consultation-on-planning

(ii) Open and Accountable Local Government – this gives the ability for Council meetings to be videoed/recorded and for tweets to be sent during Council meetings. This includes Parish meetings.

https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/343182 /140812 Openness Guide.pdf

(SA) also informed the group that Steve Gower (Police Architectural Liaison Officer) has left and that Gail Kevern is covering his work, although she will need to be trained.

PG

Next year H&S requires designers to be responsible for H&S on site. Agents should not be allowed to submit poor quality drawings. *PG passed around an A4 print of a poor quality drawing* – he said he didn't know why the application had been validated.

(RR) responded that as long as the plan was to scale, we had no choice but to validate it. If the planner found it to be inaccurate on site, the application would have then been invalidated at a later date.

(SA) added that H&S isn't enforced by the Planning Department.

9. Date of Next Meeting

Some discussion took place as to what day of the week suited everyone. It was generally agreed that afternoons may be better

Formal Meeting: 25 November 2014 – venue to be confirmed. Informal Meeting: 3 March 2015 at 3.30pm – Venue to be confirmed.