

Comments of Local Groups and Societies	Officer comments	Action proposed	Time scale
---	-------------------------	------------------------	-------------------

1. Planning application Process

Letters			
Tenants of flats don't always appreciate they can comment on applications.	We welcome planning comments from all parties	Ensure consultation letter makes clear occupiers as well as owners and freeholders can comment More use of site notices to maximize public consultation	October 2005 Ongoing
Fewer occasions when catchment area for consultation too small and use of site notices more effective	Pleased that use of site notices being more effective	Continue with present system	
Libraries			
Rare for plans not to be available at libraries following consultation process.	Improvements from last year noted	Continue with present system	
Can paper decision notices go to libraries	All decisions are scanned and are available on the Web site in accordance with e-Govn targets. Groups must recognise that Council's have to move to e-Govn.	Decision notification letter to interested parties to advise that viewing of decision possible on Web site.	Done
Can copies of plans etc go to more than one library; particular issue in TD/HW. Use postcode to differentiate. Concern that can't easily understand schemes on screen.	All plans can be seen at any library via Web site. We are already running duplicate systems by sending plans to relevant libraries. .Electronic application submissions due soon therefore more expensive	Need to examine consultation letter to ensure receiver knows Web site can be accessed via all libraries Major schemes have been sent to two libraries if affecting two wards.	September 2005

Difficulty with printing off copies of larger plans. Colour plans more difficult to down load.	and against e-Govn initiatives to send hard copies to libraries.	Cost of colour printers too expensive for each library.	
Site notices			
Notices now facing to pavement and being removed after period of consultation		Continue with present system	
Web site			
No comments			
Overdevelopment in Borough			
Concern about refusals of small house with replacement larger one particularly if it would improve the area. HSG policy needs to be more flexible. Could such a case go to Committee rather than delegated decision?	Need to address more than just visual amenity in such cases. More intensive development can still give appearance of one house. However, each application considered on its merits and if case made for 'one for one' replacement this will be assessed accordingly. Case can be referred to Committee by objectors but need for Council to deal with 90% cases by delegation. Open to applicant to appeal if refused.	Current Supplementary Planning Document work into infill etc housing under way as part of LDF. This will pick up on examples of good practice etc. Policies will be reviewed as part of LDF process.	February 2006
Letters of objection			
No comments			
Communications during application			

process			
<p>Quality of drawings generally better but sections of shopfronts and better detailing necessary on occasions.</p> <p>Strip elevations essential in some situations.</p>	<p>Noted, but sometimes deficiencies not always obvious until site visit made.</p> <p>Agreed. BLT policy sets out need for such information, esp. in conservation areas</p> <p>Officers are considering a form of contract with applicants that they provide the necessary accurate and full plans & the Council will be able to deal with applications more quickly, as every one benefits from full information.</p>	<p>Remind staff to be vigilant over details on plans</p> <p>Remind staff to press for this information when relevant. It is referred to in 'How to make a planning application' document published by Richmond.</p>	
Amended plans			
No problems identified			
Committee procedures			
A particular case raised where several Cllrs abstained from voting. Env O & S Committee should investigate.	<p>It is understood this is the subject of a complaint which the Council will respond to.</p> <p>However, there are occasions when Cllr do abstain & this is permissible under Committee procedures.</p>		
Additional points raised			
Ham & Petersham Association concerned that roof extension decisions are made in isolation by different officers without recourse to	We have meetings on a regular basis to ensure consistency. Team Leader also acts as conduit to ensure consistency. We also use Design Guidelines to advise and measure proposals against. However,	Maintain current practice.	

other on going applications. Is leading to a changed environment.	it is inevitable that gradual change does occur but it needs to be managed.		
Richmond Society requested criteria for delegated Vs Committee decisions.	Provided. Delegated scheme on Web site.		
Richmond Society requested clarification of Cllr roles	<p>Probity issue. Distinction made between Planning Committee members and other Cllrs. Former must not prejudice their independent role at Planning Cttee. The latter can speak for residents at Committee but cannot vote or lobby Planning members.</p> <p>Cllr protocol on Web site.</p>		

2. Appeals

No comments offered.			
----------------------	--	--	--

3. Enforcement

No new issues raised although some believe powers are limited to deal with contraveners.	<p>Officer described various initiatives.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) red card system ii) temporary stop notices iii) New street team iv) blitzes on illegal advert signs v) action against shutters vi) more prosecutions of adverts plus higher fines 		
--	---	--	--

	Officers noted that enforcement could be better prioritized and requested feedback from Groups.		
Other matters			
Query over whether Harlequins should be implementing s106 benefits	Officers will pursue with Team Leader and reply to inquirer		
Richmond Soc raised issue of joined up thinking between Planning & Licensing.	They are separate statutory regulatory processes. It is possible for each to provide different decisions on similar issues due to the independent controls available. However, the LDF will work towards the same objectives as Licensing. Legal advice recommends Licensing is likely to be the lead regulatory authority on this issue.	LDF work.	Ongoing.

4. LDF

Suggestion for workshop with Agenda 21 Group in Autumn	To be included in issues consultation	Arrange	October/November 2005
Meeting to discuss draft SCI appreciated and found helpful	Noted		

5 Supplementary Planning Documents

--	--	--	--

Site briefs/guidance	Reported that Crane valley, Barns Goods Yard, Terrace Yard, Friars Lane, Quality design, Small and Medium sized Housing sites, and Energy efficient Design, Public Space Design guide being progressed	Progress adoption	
Need for other briefs considered – Heath Road and Star and Garter mentioned as potential sites	Need for briefs for major sites to be kept under review	Star & Garter site under consideration for a planning brief..	To be programmed as appropriate
Design Quality	Reported that Design panel was being established		

6 Historic buildings

BTSS/Article 4s	Reported that 300 new BTMs in recent years; 11 buildings at risk.		
Need for a programme to review older CA Studies	Programme to be developed.		October 2005

7 Environmental improvements/street scene

Public Space Design Guide and Local Champions initiatives	Progress was explained.		
Need to improve liaison with public	To be considered further with		December 2005

utilities	Highway colleagues		
-----------	--------------------	--	--