

Cambridge City Council: Protocol for Providing Pre-Application Advice and Charges

Public Participation Report

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
1. Introduction				
1.1				
5586 - Haslingfield Parish Council	Comment	<p>I have no objection to charging large scale developers for advice, but it seems odd to charge someone for help with a house or extension. Don't we pay council tax for this?</p> <p>It seems like just another level of bureacracy , I thought it was supposed to be cutting down - I agree larger developments OK but not minor work</p>	Comment noted. The Council is not proposing to apply pre-application charging to householder developments at the present time.	.
5301 - Bradmore & Petersfield Residents Association	Comment	<p>Dear Patsy: Charge away. I must say that our organisation's faith in the democratic value of the current planning system vanished entirely after we fought unsuccessfully against ARU and your planning officers to try and stop ARU building an unattractive barn 4 metres from one of your own conservation areas. Hardly a murmur was raised by any of your team: they liked it! Compromise is one thing; capitulation is another.</p> <p>We were also struck by the clear signs that your people (and the planning committee) feared having to pay costs after an appeal rather than stand up for aesthetic standards. Pathetic.</p>	Support. This consultation is purely related to the proposed pre-application charging process. The Council takes seriously the involvement of local communities in the decision making process. However, the concerns raised are outside the parameters of this consultation.	
1.3				
5942 - Glisson Road/Tension Road Area Residents Association	Object	The introduction of charges is presumed to be an endeavour to discourage poorly supported bids to achieve new developments which may not meet the latest criteria set by Government and adopted by Local Planning Department and also to cover some of the costs of public hearings on those schemes. On the face of it, it appears to be a good idea,economically. However, insofar as it stultifies proper local involvement in decisions which directly	Comment noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		affect their rights to express opinions and present legitimate concerns about their environment, their security and comfort, the application of such restrictions are of some concern.		
5963 - University of Cambridge	Object	<p>The University, , does not favour the introduction of such charges for the reasons set out below. Firstly, we believe it is the wrong time in the economic cycle to be considering the introduction of these additional charges. The development industry continues to experience difficulties while the Government is keen to encourage development, introducing additional costs at this time cannot be conducive to economic recovery</p> <p>If however, the Council does decide to proceed to introduce charges, then the University believes that any revenue raised should be used to provide additional resources to improve the service provided not to offset departmental running costs. Any income should be ring-fenced to deliver an enhanced level of service to applicants.</p>	<p>Concerns noted. Many Councils already operate a system of charging and its introduction helps recover the public cost of providing a non-statutory service. It would be at the discretion of the University whether it chooses to use this service. The fees are proportionate to the costs of providing the advice.</p> <p>Comments noted in relation to any revenue raised from pre-application charging.</p>	
5588 - Haslingfield Parish Council	Object	<p>The proposal to charge for pre application advice is headed Cambridge City Council and therefore no relevance to HPC. If SDC adopt the same there is no legal requirement to pre advise so it is simply a money making exercise, private householders will be faced with extra costs and developers will pass costs onto the house sale. The proposal is scandalous.</p>	<p>Concerns noted. The Council is not proposing to apply pre-application charging to householder developments at the present time. Comments on South Cambridgeshire's pre-application charges should be directed to that organisation.</p>	Comments noted - no actions
5949 - Countryside Properties (Special Projects) Ltd	Support	<p>Many local authorities now charge for pre-application advice and we do not object to this in principle.</p> <p>We have benefited from a good pre-application service to date from the Major Development Growth Team, now the New Neighbourhoods team, and if charging allows this to continue and be expanded upon, including by providing advice in writing, it is welcomed in principle.</p> <p>A more structured approach is welcomed.</p>	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		Charging should help to filter out speculative and poor quality proposals allowing more time for local authorities to focus on good quality applications.		
5267 5477 5481 - Petersfield Area Community Trust (PACT)	Support	Support for Pre-application charges	Support noted.	
5958 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	We support the proposal and understand the need to better recover costs. The County, are exploring what the best approach might be to pre-application charging. In support of this, we are undertaking a benchmarking exercise which will help to determine hourly charge out rates which should help to ensure transparency regarding potential future costs. In this case, we would welcome assurance that you would you be willing to include reference to costs for County advice and that you would amend your schedule to include reference to this once we have concluded work on our charging schedule, anticipated spring 2012.	The Council notes the County Council's exploration of pre-application charging etc. Should the County Council opt to charge for pre-application advice, this will need to be added to the base charges.	

2. The Benefits of Pre-Application Advice

2.1

5964 - University of Cambridge	Comment	The introduction of charges will do nothing to encourage applicants to seek advice resulting in poorer quality submissions, additional work for the Council's planning officers, increased time and costs for the Council. The introduction of charging appears to be driven by budgetary pressures rather than any desire to improve the service. No estimates are provided of the sums likely to be raised or the costs of administering the new system but it may be that the costs may exceed the monies collected. Experience suggests that the benefits are limited and unless additional resources are made available to support the 'paid for' service the other parts of the service will suffer. This is particularly concerning in that many applicants will qualify for 'free' advice and, as 'paid for' advice will be prioritised, other applicants will receive a poorer service. This cannot surely be the intention	Comment noted. There is no evidence to suggest that this would be the outcome. The introduction of charging is likely to improve the quality of submissions. Free advice will not suffer on the basis that paid advice will be prioritised. The Council will continue to operate its Duty Planning Officer service. The estimated income from the service is between Â£20-Â£40,000 pa. Which will cover the costs of providing pre-application advice.
--------------------------------	---------	--	---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		of the City Council.		
5943 - Glisson Road/Tension Road Area Residents Association	Object	From recent observation, Planning Officers are already using NPPF, the presumption in favour of sustainable development, as an opportunity to totally block justified concern about the local effects of decisions and public protest can be ignored and imposing decisions without proper attention to justified objections.	Concerns noted. The Council takes seriously the involvement of local communities in the decision making process, however, the concerns raised are outside the parameters of this consultation exercise.	
<i>Bullet 3</i>				
5482 - Petersfield Area Community Trust (PACT)	Comment	Under section 2.1, third bullet point: 'and be more likely to result in a positive outcome' - change to 'and be more likely to result in a positive outcome (but see caveat below)'. (See also our points 2 and 6.)	Comments noted. Paragraph 2.1 bullet point 3 will be amended to read "and be more likely to result in a positive outcome".	Comments noted. Paragraph 2.1 bullet point 3 will be amended to read "and be more likely to result in a positive outcome".
<i>Bullet 5</i>				
5269 - Bruce Stuart Architects	Comment	My experience is that proposals are sometimes rejected at informal advice stage but later approved by other officers, this would certainly not be acceptable if the applicant was charged for the advice (accepting that committees will often overturn officers' recommendations).	The pre-application advice provided in the future will be on the same basis as previous pre-application advice i.e. that they are informal views only based on the information provided. Matters can only be considered fully upon receipt of a planning application, and a thorough assessment against development plan policy and other material planning considerations, including neighbour and other third party representations and comments. Any views will not bind any Committee decision on the application, nor any decision made by senior officers under delegated powers. The potential for an application to be rejected following a positive response at pre-application stage cannot be ruled out.	No changes to pre-application document
3. Proposals Requiring a Fee				
<i>3.1</i>				
5484 - Petersfield Area Community Trust (PACT)	Comment	Under current section 3.1: For the sake of clarity, we suggest the following addition to the first sentence: '...Customer Service Centre, which will be free of charge for individual householders seeking advice about extensions, outhouses, attic conversions,	Comment noted. Paragraph 3.1 will have the following text added "The Council will not charge for pre-application discussions by individual householders over proposed extensions, attic conversions etc"	Comment noted. Paragraph 3.1 will have the following text added "The Council will not charge for pre-application discussions by individual householders over proposed extensions, attic conversions etc"

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		conservation area restrictions, etc.' We feel very strongly that council tax should pay for such advice to individual householders, and that this should be spelled out explicitly.		
5959 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Comment	Initial findings from the County benchmarking exercise are that the average hourly rate across counties is Â£47. It would be helpful to have more clarity about what your hourly rate is and how your proposed charges are expected to work, what is included/ extra and perhaps make this clear in the Schedule for all to see.	Comment noted.	
5589 - Haslingfield Parish Council	Comment	I agree with many of the comments above. I see no reason not to charge professional developers but would not want to charge domestic householders. I believe that charging for pre application advice has problems, What if the advice is paid for and permission denied? What if advice is paid for (guaranteeing approval) - the planning permission has effectively been short circuited etc?	The pre-application advice provided in the future will be on the same basis as previous pre-application advice i.e that they are only informal views based on the information provided. The matter can only be considered fully on receipt of a planning application, and through assessment against development plan policy and other material considerations, including neighbour and other third party representations and comments.	
5948 - Girton Parish Council	Object	Why we were not happy is that as a neighbour to the City Council many planning applications made to and by our respective councils have impact on each other. In part this is why in development terms the City Council and South Cambs Council work together on such projects as NIAB and North West Cambridge. The Committee feel it is unfair we could be charged the same fees for advice as commercial developers whose finances and internal sources of information are far greater than a parish council. Would the City Council be willing to waive charges for consultation made by the Parish Council.	The inclusion of additional categories of development that benefit from free pre-application advice can be considered in the review of the scheme once implemented. However, there are other mechanisms by which schemes that provide community benefit could access funding to pay for such advice. This should be considered in the round once the scheme has been up and running.	
5965 - University of Cambridge	Object	If the Council does decide to proceed to introduce charges, then the University believes that any revenue raised should be used to provide additional resources to improve the service provided not to offset departmental running costs. Any income should be ring-fenced to deliver an enhanced level of service to applicants.	Concerns noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
------------------------	---------------	------------------------------	-----------------------------	---------------

4. Proposed Schedule of Charges

A. Strategic Development Proposals

5485 - Petersfield Area Community Trust (PACT)	Comment	The proposed schedule of charges (current section 4) seems overly generous, especially for categories A (strategic development proposals) and B (major development). Given the amount of time case officers devote to pre-application advice (both in terms of meetings and in providing written advice), we feel the charges in these categories could be doubled.	Comment noted. The process will be subject to review after 12 months. There will be an opportunity to increase charges if it is demonstrated that costs are not be covered. However, the Council cannot make a profit from the process.
--	---------	---	---

A1

5955 - Countryside Properties (Special Projects) Ltd	Object	In order to explain the new system more fully, and for applicants to gain an understanding as to why it is being introduced, it may be appropriate to publicise how this new source of income will be used. Minor householder proposals do not appear to be on the charging schedule, and it is unclear how certain small proposals such as new shop fronts would be dealt with. Would the duty officer system continue to cover such enquiries on a payment free basis?	Concerns noted. The Council is not proposing to apply pre-application charging to householder developments at the present time. The duty officer system will continue on a free basis.
--	--------	---	---

5268 5298	Support	Do charges meet the costs	Support noted. The charge has been calculated by considering similar charging regimes used at other local authorities and assessing the amount of officer time spent on pre-application work. Charges will be subject to review after 12 months.
--------------	---------	---------------------------	--

A3

5957 - Countryside Properties (Special Projects) Ltd	Comment	Reference to bespoke charges for large-scale strategic proposals - with no indication of a range of costs - is a significant concern. How would this be managed? How would fees be agreed? There needs to be a fixed set of criteria such as which officers are involved (with the opportunity for the developer to request certain officers), number of meetings, length of meetings etc. It is hoped that the collaborative approach adopted to date will continue and that this will not be replaced by a formulaic approach with little flexibility.	Comment noted. Bespoke processes will need to be agreed at the outset depending on the scale and complexity of the individual proposals. The Council will be responsible for allocations of individual officer resources. Realistically, given overall workload levels, allocation of resources will largely depend on officer availability at the time. Costs of the Quality Panel will form part of more detailed guidance for applicants prior to the operation of the scheme.
--	---------	--	--

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<p>The consultation notes states that the Council will charge the costs of any pre-application quality panel presentations on top of other charges. No amount is suggested and as with the bespoke charging for large-scale strategic proposals, it would be beneficial to set out an expected range.</p> <p>It is not clear whether advice given prior to condition submissions would be chargeable.</p>		
<i>B. Major Development</i>				
5486 - Petersfield Area Community Trust (PACT)	Comment	<p>The proposed schedule of charges (current section 4) seems overly generous, especially for categories A (strategic development proposals) and B (major development). Given the amount of time case officers devote to pre-application advice (both in terms of meetings and in providing written advice), we feel the charges in these categories could be doubled.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The process will be subject to review after 12 months. There will be an opportunity to increase charges if it is demonstrated that costs are not being covered. However, the Council cannot make a profit from the process.</p>	
5960 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	<p>In your charging schedule, you set out a range of costs for different types and sizes of developments. For example for major developments, the charge set out is Â£500 for one meeting including written follow up. More clarity as to what these costs cover in terms of officers involved and expertise would be beneficial. Will this cover only City planning advice or will it include related areas on design, drainage/suds, highways, travel assessments, S106, archaeology etc. A number of these areas are where the County would be called on to advise. Therefore it would be helpful to ascertain whether the charge includes costs for County advice where relevant, and if so, how and at what rate (presumably in line with average hourly rates mentioned) is this expected to be reimbursed to cover costs. Clarity on this issue is welcomed.</p>	<p>Concerns noted. The rates will be set out more clearly in pre-application guidance notes.</p> <p>The Council notes the County Council's exploration of pre-application charging.</p>	
<i>C. Minor Development</i>				
5587 - Haslingfield Parish Council	Comment	<p>I think there needs to be a different classification for 'Developers' and householders who would like to improve their property through an alteration</p>	<p>Comment noted. There is no charge for householder development e.g. extensions. The comparative costs relating to minor applications for residential and non-residential development are considered to</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		or extension. The householders pay council tax to fund these services, but the developers do not!	be appropriate.	
		3 other councillors agreed with the proposals above		
<i>CI</i>				
5270 - Bruce Stuart Architects	Comment	There seems to be no difference in cost between a small domestic extension and 9 commercial units - this seems strange.	Comment noted. There is no charge for householder development e.g. extensions. The comparative costs relating to minor applications for residential and non-residential development are considered to be appropriate.	
<i>E. Permitted Development</i>				
5271 - Bruce Stuart Architects	Comment	Presumably the checking to confirm whether or not the proposal is permitted development is not considered pre-application advice and would not be charged for?	Comment noted. The charges only relate to advice in advance of planning application and advice on the need for planning permission for non-householder development (permitted development). There is currently no charge for obtaining informal advice on the need for planning permission for householder development although the submission of an application for a Lawful Development Certificate is encouraged for which a charge is made.	
<i>Note</i>				
5478 5479	Comment	Fees should not include VAT and meetings should be time limited	Comment noted. Fees stated include VAT to offer clarity on costs of the process. Fees for planning applications are advertised on the same basis. It is not considered to be necessary to time limit meetings as the costs reflect having longer meetings for more complex proposals. Any views will not bind any Committee decision on the application, nor any decision made by senior officers under delegated powers. The potential for an application to be rejected following a positive response at pre-application stage can not be ruled out.	
5966 - University of Cambridge	Object	We note that the Government may shortly permit the Local Authorities to set their own planning fees and, if	Concerns noted. This could be considered under Local Fee Setting, but many pre-application queries	No changes to be taken forwards

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<p>charging for pre-application advice is to be introduced, we believe it would be more sensible to introduce these charges as part of a single package of fee changes rather than as a series of incremental changes. Neither would we wish to be charged twice for the service.</p> <p>While we do not support the introduction of these charges, on specific matters of detail, we believe that the protocol needs to be amended to:-</p> <p>1) make clear whether the fees relate to all types of application, eg. Full. Outline. Reserved Matter or whether there are different rates for different types of application.</p> <p>ii) make it clear that there is no pre-application fee for advice on applications for Conservation Area Consent</p> <p>iii) include pre-application advice on advertisements at 'no charge'</p>	<p>do not materialise into formal applications and likewise many development proposals change from pre-application to formal application, so it may be difficult to operate a single fee system.</p>	

5. The Pre-Application Process - How it will operate

5.1

5950 - Countryside Properties (Special Projects) Ltd	Comment	It would be useful to have a standard meeting request form.	Comment noted.	Provide a standard meeting request form as part of a pre-application information available through the Council's website.
5961 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	<p>Pre-application advice is critically important and the benefits are clear. It will be imperative that the planning authorities continue to encourage early engagement with applicants and that they engage early with the local community. It may be more appropriate if Authorities and the County adopted a joined up approach to charging in relation to major developments, as otherwise there is a risk that a developer may be charged 3 times for advice.</p> <p>There could be one overall fee divided proportionately, depending on resource input from each of the partners. This would ensure that applicants engage with the key stakeholders early, and there is clarity between partners on key issues. This would also enable the often crucial advice from our colleagues in Highways, Archaeology and other services around S106 and travel assessments to be</p>	<p>The Council is already working closely with South Cambridgeshire Council on the coordination of pre-application charging for major sites.</p> <p>The Council notes the County Council's exploration of pre-application advice charging.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		taken into account early.		
<hr/>				
5.2				
5272 - Bruce Stuart Architects	Comment	21 days is excessive	Comment noted. There is no differentiation for the time period for setting a meeting between different types of enquiry. 21 days is a maximum and it is anticipated that it will be less for straightforward enquiries.	
<hr/>				
5951 - Countryside Properties (Special Projects) Ltd	Object	Some flexibility should be retained. For example in certain instances an urgent meeting may be required and waiting up to (or longer than) 21 days may not be in the interests of either party. Having said that a fair system of registering requests for pre-application advice will be important. It would be worth allowing developers to pay monies on account to save time, with any excess amount then being deducted from the application fee. It would be useful if the written advice includes an indication of S106 expectations/costs and advice on CIL (which it is understood will be consulted upon in late 2011).	Concerns noted. The Council is mindful of the comments and occasional urgent need for meetings and, within reason, will arrange meetings accordingly in light of this.	
<hr/>				
5.3				
5956 - Countryside Properties (Special Projects) Ltd	Object	In the section 'The Pre-Application Process - How it will operate' reference is made to potential further discussions with the case officer being advisable in order to ensure that enough information is submitted to validate the application. It is assumed this discussion will not be chargeable.	Concerns noted. Further advice on application validation and information to be submitted will be provided.	Further advice on application validation and information to be submitted will be provided.
<hr/>				
5.4				
5273 - Bruce Stuart Architects	Comment	Presumably a copy of the minutes will be issued to the attendees?	Comment noted. Minutes will be made by the case officer to enable a written response to be provided in accordance with Paragraph 5.5.	
<hr/>				
5.5				

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5967 - University of Cambridge	Comment	Any advice provided should be professional, timely, comprehensive and constructive and be advice that applicants can confidently rely upon. The fee should be refundable if any subsequent application, based on the pre-application advice provided, is refused. Performance against identified service delivery targets for the provision of pre-application advice should be measured and published so that service improvements can be monitored.	<p>Comment noted. The pre-application advice provided in the future will be on the same basis of previous pre-application advice i.e. that they are informal views only based on the information provided and that the matter can only be considered fully upon receipt of a planning application, and a thorough assessment against development plan policy and other material planning considerations, including neighbour and other third party representations and comments.</p> <p>Any views will not bind any Committee decision on the application, nor any decision made by senior officers under delegated powers.</p> <p>The potential for an application to be rejected following a positive response at pre-application stage cannot be ruled out. On this basis it is not agreed that the fee would be refundable.</p>	
5274 - Bruce Stuart Architects	Comment	14 days is excessive	<p>Comment noted. There is no differentiation for the time period for responding to different types of enquiry. 21 days is a maximum and it is anticipated that it will be less for straightforward enquiries.</p>	
5952 - Countryside Properties (Special Projects) Ltd	Object	<p>A review period should be set out whereby all parties are given the opportunity to comment on the service and refinements are made. Certain other local authorities have such processes built in and have made adjustments to the service over time.</p> <p>The tone and content of responses from the Council will be very important. Merely setting out a list of planning policies will not be acceptable; a constructive and comprehensive response will be expected once fees are paid. This should be produced following consultation with all key officers and should highlight all important points as early in the process as possible. It is important that the advice then forms the basis for officer consideration once the application has been submitted.</p>	<p>The LPA will review the operation of the service after twelve months.</p> <p>The advice will be tailored to the request and will be constructive.</p>	
5.6				
5953 - Countryside Properties	Object	A review period should be set out whereby all parties	Concerns noted. The Council will review the	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
(Special Projects) Ltd		are given the opportunity to comment on the service and refinements are made. Certain other local authorities have such processes built in and have made adjustments to the service over time.	operation of the service after one year.	

5.7

5954 - Countryside Properties (Special Projects) Ltd	Object	Planning Performance Agreements should be considered as an option. These offer a collaborative approach where issues, timescales, costs and requirements such as community involvement are agreed at an early stage. What are the City Council's view on PPAs? If PPAs are established it will be crucial for the County Council to be signed up to the process.	Concerns noted. Planning Performance Agreements are already being considered by the Council.	
--	--------	--	--	--

6. Community Involvement in the Planning Process

6.1

5487 - Petersfield Area Community Trust (PACT)	Comment	Under current section 6.1, first sentence: delete 'often'. In our experience, local exhibitions, public meetings, etc. serve little or no useful purpose after a planning application has been submitted. Especially for strategic and major development proposals, pre-application community involvement should be the norm, without offering developers any loopholes (as suggested by the word 'often').	Comment noted. Paragraph 6.1 "often" will be deleted.	Comment noted. Paragraph 6.1 "often" will be deleted.
--	---------	---	---	---

5944 - Glisson Road/Tension Road Area Residents Association	Comment	In addition to that, the arbitrary relegation of Planning decisions (to the East Ctee for example) where presentations by objectors, restricted to one minute only, are relegated to very brief consideration by tired Ctees to end-of-Agenda, late night sittings (one we opposed was not heard until 24.10 at the end of a meeting started at 7pm) and was summarily refused by A Planning Officer clearly operating under the 'presumption in favour' approach for all five Planning Applications heard that evening. It undermines so-called Localism and deprives council tax payers their rights to participate in the preservation of the communal good. Your claim to encourage community involvement in the planning process is not well-supported by recent experience.	Comment noted. The Council takes seriously the involvement of local communities in the decision making process, however, the concerns raised are outside the parameters of this consultation.	
---	---------	---	---	--

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5962 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	Planning authorities should investigate how to support the delivery of improved outcomes for local communities across Cambridgeshire. Especially as budgets and resources have been reduced. One solution could be to exempt pre application charges on developments which deliver 'community benefit'. This would need to be defined clearly to avoid misinterpretation e.g. development that fulfils a public function such as schools, libraries, community halls, playgrounds, hospitals etc. East Cambridgeshire is a good example of this. Adopting a County wide approach to exempting development proposals such as these which deliver a community benefit could ensure a joined up approach which would help to achieve the best community outcomes. Would Cambridge City Council be willing to consider such an approach as a means of supporting the delivery of community outcomes and fostering the delivery of sustainable development?	Concerns noted. The inclusion of additional categories of development that benefit from free pre-application advice can be considered in the review of the scheme once implemented. However, there are other mechanisms by which schemes that provide community benefit could access funding to pay for such advice.	
5476	Support	The Nineteen Acre Field Residents Association (whom I am representing for the purposes of this response) welcomes the encouragement given in 6.1 for early community involvement in the planning process and, in particular, the requirement for comments obtained during such a consultation to be taken into account by developers. By requiring that the details of such consultation be given in any subsequent planning application it will also be clear when developers have chosen to ignore this provision and not to undertake such consultation. This, too, should be of benefit to local communities.	Support noted.	

7. Without Prejudice Footnote

7.1

5275 - Bruce Stuart Architects	Comment	Presumably the outcome of this professional advice, which attracts fees is to be made known in the formal documentation and presentation of the application?	Comment noted. Pre-application advice would not automatically become public information on the receipt of a formal application. However the applicant would be at liberty to include the pre-application advice as part of his submission, which would then become publicly available. There is no change to this process in comparison with current practice.	
--------------------------------	---------	--	--	--

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5483 - Petersfield Area Community Trust (PACT) 5488 - Petersfield Area Community Trust (PACT)	Comment	Without prejudice caveat suggested.	<p>Comment noted. The addition of a caveat is not considered to be necessary. Subject to clarification of the fact that any views will not bind any Committee decision on the application, nor any decision made by senior officers under delegated powers is necessary it is considered that this point is properly addressed in part 7.</p> <p>Part 7 is at the end of the document which is expected will leave a lasting impact on the reader. Advice on householder development is free of charge both in relation to pre-application advice and permitted development queries. The view that this should be highlighted in the document is supported.</p> <p>Add two rows to table at section 4. The charge has been calculated by considering similar charging regimes used at other local authorities and assessing the amount of officer time spent on pre-application work. Charges will be subject to review</p>	
5480	Comment	Section 7 should state that applications are determined not by case officers but by the Planning Committee.	<p>Comment noted. Clarification of the fact that any views will not bind any Committee decision on the application, nor any decision made by senior officers under delegated powers is necessary.</p>	<p>Add clarification to Section 7, of the fact that any views will not bind any Committee decision on the application, nor any decision made by senior officers under delegated powers is necessary.</p>