## Perth and Kinross Council The Environment Service

## Planning Users Forum 10am Wednesday 2nd May 2012, MR 13/14 Pullar House

## Present:

Peter Marshall - PKC (Chair)

Diane Cassidy - PKC

Brian Stanford - PKC

Brenda Murray - PKC

Nan Johnston - Dunkeld & Birnam Community Council

Neil Smith - GS Brown

Alan Brown - GS Brown

Stan Bruce - CPKCC

Alistair Wood - Savills

Dr Robin Cairncross - Poartmoak Community Council

Sandy Morrison - Fossoway Community Council

Peter Ely – Kenmore Community Council

Jim Brown – J R Brown Building Design

Ellen Webster – James Denholm Partnership

Alex Fernie Crieff Community Council

Nicola Barclay – Homes for Scotland

## **Apologies:**

Isobel Butt – Civic Trust, Bruce Patterson – Highland Perthshire Communities Partnership, Nick Brian - PKC

		Action By
1	Minute of Previous Meeting 27 April 2011	
	<ul> <li>It was commented that the minutes should reflect the issues discussed better. Those present were asked to send any suggestions for changes as soon as possible after the minutes are distributed.</li> </ul>	
	<ul> <li>2 – This discussion was about cross boundary issues and how we get good communication across borders. Peter to put on next Tayplan agenda.</li> </ul>	PM
	<ul> <li>4 – Correspondence Performance – it was discussed that email correspondence was not included in the statistics.</li> <li>4- correction – satisfaction should read 'dissatisfaction'</li> </ul>	
2	Matters Arising	
	<ul> <li>Advertising – DC contacted all Community Councils after the last meeting to seek advice on which are the best local publications for them. DC collated the information and it was passed round the meeting. This will be used in future consultations.</li> <li>8 – Section 75 Agreements – Discussion about the benefits of having this information available to the public. Some</li> </ul>	

2	information can be found on committee reports. It was agreed that Heads of Terms should be in the public domain and that we need to identify sections of interest to communities and let communities know. The legal requirement is that this information should be available on the website. This is to be looked at and improved	PM/BS
3	New Domestic Development Rights	
	<ul> <li>The government predicted that this would reduce applications but there are cases where permission in now needed when it wouldn't have been needed before</li> <li>Guidance notes are available on the PKC website, people were asked to give feedback. There is also a frequently asked questions section. <a href="http://www.pkc.gov.uk/NR/rdonlyres/9D184449-0DB0-49B9-AB6F-39B2E1F97683/0/HouseholderPermittedDevelopmentRights2012Guidance">http://www.pkc.gov.uk/NR/rdonlyres/9D184449-0DB0-49B9-AB6F-39B2E1F97683/0/HouseholderPermittedDevelopmentRights2012Guidance</a></li> </ul>	
	Note.pdf  The government are proposing that feet are reduced for small	
	<ul> <li>The government are proposing that fees are reduced for small scale developments.</li> </ul>	
	<ul> <li>Issue raised that it may cause problems in areas with large</li> </ul>	
	conservation areas.	
	Some Councils are requesting people apply for a Certificate of	
	Lawfulness when previously they would have received a Letter of Comfort, this is not the case with PKC but we can issue	
	these if needed.	
4	Development Management – new structure	
	The Development Management team has been restructured and now teams are made up of people dealing with the same types of applications rather than in geographical areas. The staff can now be better supervised to meet targets. (ATTACH ORGANISATIONAL CHART)	
	<ul> <li>Performance has improved since September 2011. The target is to respond to enquires within 15 working days, figures in March 2012 showed 96% of householder applications were dealt with in this period. Charts were passed round. The number of applications has levelled out with a slight increase recently. Fossoway CC commented that they were pleased with recent response times and has seen the system improve.</li> </ul>	BS
	with recent response times and has seen the system improve significantly recently.	ЪЗ
	<ul> <li>It was commented at the meeting that the improvement had been noticed although it still sometimes takes a long time to discharge conditions and an effort is needed to improve this.</li> </ul>	
5	Brian to look into a way of monitoring this.	
3	<ul> <li>Landscape Plans</li> <li>PM suggested that some of the issues could be resolved if</li> </ul>	
	more developers carried out pre-application discussions with communities and made amendments to plans before sending in planning applications. Landscape plans should be included in applications from the start if it is specified in the	
	<ul> <li>Development Plan</li> <li>The issue was raised that landscape plans are not shown on the PKC website with planning applications and often</li> </ul>	

	landscaping is not done properly. When complaints are made about this there is no enforcement.	
6	Development Plan Update	
U .	<ul> <li>The period of representation is now closed. 1550 representations were received; these are now being registered and acknowledged. The comments will be analysed to build up a picture of key points on various sites. After this a report will be made to the Council.</li> <li>Representations will be scanned and posted on the PKC website, but this will take a while to do.</li> <li>Scottish Government guidance is not to make amendments but to submit the plan with representations and responses from the Council by the end of the year to Ministers. The Reporters will then make any decisions, send out neighbour notifications and hold public hearings where necessary. Once the reporter has seen the plan the Council will make any modifications needed. If we were to make modifications first, the process would be delayed at least one year.</li> </ul>	
7	Reserved Matters	
	Question asked if an Outline Application is needed for developments before a full application is submitted. This has been replaced by 'Planning Application in Principle' and more detail is needed at this stage due to environmental rules.	
8	Pre-application meetings with Planning Officers	
	<ul> <li>A case was raised that a site meeting was requested by a developer and refused by the Planners. After Councillors intervened a meeting was agreed after a period of 2 months. This is a resource issue and these requests are usually dealt with as a desk top exercise as there is not time for lengthy discussions and site visits.</li> <li>Concern was raised over the aloofness of PKC Planning Officers and there is reluctance for discussions with Community Councils. In rare circumstances direct contact and site visits would be useful.</li> <li>Community Councils suggested that Planners could let them know when they will be in the area to look at sites and this would allow informal discussions to take place.</li> <li>The Scottish Government are saying that the proposed increased fees should cover pre-application discussions in future.</li> <li>Protocol is needed for this to prioritise resources and this will be taken up with Nick Brian and David Littlejohn.</li> <li>Emails with Service requests to start being logged and go through the monitoring process.</li> </ul>	NB/DL
9	<ul> <li>Suggestions for Future Topics</li> <li>Travellers Sites – it would be useful to have the Gypsy Traveller Liaison Officer explain the protocol for dealing with unauthorised encampments. Also Retrospective Planning should be covered although it was recognised this did not only apply to these sites.</li> <li>Housing in the Countryside – Letter from the Chief Planner –</li> </ul>	
	Occupancy restrictions - <a href="http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Topics/Built-">http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Topics/Built-</a>	

Environment/planning/National-Planning-Policy/themes/housing/Occupancyrestrictions Windfall Houses – cumulative affect of multiple small developments on infrastructure Renewables – including wind turbines, hydro. Session to be organised out with theses meetings for CCs and other interest groups. AGLV's and their replacement with Local Landscape Designations. 10 **AOCB** Supplementary Guidance – this will be sent to Ministers separately to the Development Plan and goes through a different process. They will consider if there is a sufficient hook in the plan for the supplementary guidance, if it was properly consulted upon and if it is in line with national guidance. Ministers cannot modify the plan but could suggest changes. There are 5 Scottish Government consultations Consultation on the General Permitted Development Order 2012 http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Publications/2012/03/8498 Development Delivery Consultation 2012 http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Publications/2012/03/3965 Development Plan Examinations Consultation 2012 http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Publications/2012/03/3942 Consultation on Fees for Planning Applications 2012 http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Publications/2012/03/3164 Consultation on Miscellaneous Amendments to the Planning System 2012 -

The Planning User Forum is to be advised of PKC's response when it

http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Publications/2012/03/3164

Date of Next Meeting: 7<sup>TH</sup> November 2012

is issued.

11