

# **Scrutiny Inquiry Report**

## **To Review the Method by which Planning Applications are Publicised and Consultation Undertaken**

**April 2010**



# Introduction and Scope

## Introduction

1. We agreed terms of reference on 13th October 2009 for an inquiry to review the method by which planning applications are publicised and community involvement takes place.
  2. We thought this scrutiny review to be timely as it provided an opportunity to look at the ways in which planning applications are publicised and consulted on in the context of a period of considerable change.
  3. The review would also facilitate an assessment of value for money for consultation and notification practices. It would also highlight and assess the changes, which have already been made by Planning Services in the way consultation is carried out in recent times.
  4. The context of and drivers for the inquiry were that:
    - There are strict limits and timescales within which planning authorities operate.
    - The legal framework within which the planning system operates which prescribes how the process should work and how applications are dealt with. The government is committed to an ambitious planning reform agenda, which aims to speed up the planning system and increase the predictability of planning decisions. Changes include 'Planning for a Sustainable Future: White Paper', the 'Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act', changes to secondary legislation, reviews of planning policy guidance and a change in culture for the whole of the planning system.
- The Department of Communities and Local Government (CLG) have consulted on possible changes to planning regulations regarding publicising of planning applications with the aim of giving local authorities a more proportionate, effective and local approach to publicity.
  - The Local Government Association recent publication "Probity in Planning."
  - The Charter for involving Parish and Town Councils in the planning process was agreed and adopted by the Council and operational since January 2010.
  - The way in which consultation responses are weighed against other planning considerations in making decisions.
  - Members have their own experiences of the strengths and weaknesses of the current methods by which planning applications are publicised and consultation undertaken and the potential areas for improvement.
  - There is a Central Government agenda promoting greater levels of engagement, including the recent publication of the Community Empowerment White Paper, 'Communities in Control', which will increase requirements for Councils to promote, facilitate and deliver a



# Introduction and Scope

wider range of engagement activity, with demonstrable impacts on services and other decisions.

- The Leeds Strategic Plan 2008-2011 includes an improvement priority and a national indicator for increasing the number of people who feel they can influence decisions in their locality.
- The Council has legal obligations it must meet in respect of equality legislation. It is required to evidence appropriate arrangements for engaging with all communities.
- The Council is a signatory to the Compact for Leeds, where community participation and equal partnerships are key areas of focus.
- The Area Committees are about to significantly strengthen their community engagement responsibilities, including a brief to agree Area Community Engagement Plans with the goal of delivering better outcomes from local services.

consultation and notification obligations in terms of timescale, resources and legal parameters. under which the planning process operates.

- What good practice exists in other planning authorities that can be used and developed?
- What is currently being developed in house to further engage with local communities?
- What resources and other support would be required to implement any improvements identified?

## Scope of the Inquiry

5. The scope of this inquiry was to identify:

- The methods by which planning applications are advertised and consultation undertaken and the opportunities and barriers for making improvements to that process. This will need to be in the context of balancing local views whilst meeting statutory



# Conclusions and Recommendations

6. We received information at our first session on how the planning system works and in particular about the time and legal parameters in which the service operates. These constraints have an effect on the type and scope of the notification and consultation that can normally be carried out.
7. We were informed that the Department for Communities and Local Government commissioned a review in 2008, known as the Killian Pretty Review, which looked at the planning system. The review identified ways the planning process could be improved further by reducing bureaucracy and making the system more responsive and customer focused, but in ways that were consistent with the principles and objectives of the planning system.
8. A number of proposed changes were made by the Review but in the context of our Scrutiny report, recommendations 9 to 12 of the Killian Pretty Review made proposals to help improve the effectiveness of engagement.
9. Recommendation 9 of the Review sets out a number of measures to improve the involvement of consultees so that it is clearer which organisations need to be consulted, when they must be consulted, why and what response is required. This would eradicate unnecessary contact, reduce the demands placed on local planning authorities' resources, reduce the delays due to consultation and free up resources of consultees to focus on the quality of response on the applications where comments would add real value. These measures would make the planning process far more efficient.
- CLG issued a consultation document on this on 21st December 2009 and the department responded with their comments by the 19<sup>th</sup> March 2010 deadline.
10. Recommendation 10 of the Review set out measures to improve the engagement of Members, helping Members to focus their resources on the more significant developments. This will be achieved through appropriate training, clarity of the role of Members and better officer management of their relationship with Members.
11. Recommendation 11 of the Killian Pretty Review specifically sets out to improve the engagement of the local community:
  - Applicants for major developments should discuss with the council at an early point in pre-application discussions how best to engage with the local community;
  - Applicants should report the outcomes from the engagement, so that the community and the authority can easily understand what has been undertaken and how it has influenced the scheme;
  - Government should ensure that the additional resources for community engagement in planning identified in the recent Empowerment White Paper are used, in part, to help improve community engagement in the planning application process.
  - Local authorities should be given greater autonomy and flexibility to determine the best approaches to use in order to notify the public about planning applications, thus allowing them to decide whether to use local newspapers.



# Conclusions and Recommendations

12. The Government's national policy is therefore moving Local Planning Authorities (LPAs) from development control to a development management approach. The Department for Communities and Local Governments (CLGs) definition of development management is:

*"a positive and proactive approach to shaping, considering, determining and delivering development proposals. It is led by the LPA, working closely with those proposing developers and other stakeholders. It is undertaken in the spirit of partnership and inclusiveness and supports the delivery of key priorities and outcomes".*

13. It is reassuring to see that much of the work already undertaken by Leeds Planning Services is now proactive rather than reactive in accordance with the government's proposals with the introduction in 2008 of the pre-application protocol and the protocol for pre-application discussions with local communities and Ward Members. This states the responsibilities of developers in relation to community engagement. This approach of a proactive Leeds Planning Service was supported by all the witnesses we saw. They acknowledged the improvements that are being made in Leeds Planning Service whilst suggesting further improvements that could be made.

14. We were informed that the largest and most sensitive planning applications are often subject to pre-application consultation and then further notification and engagement when the application is submitted. This is usually as part of a Planning Performance Agreement.

15. The purposes of pre-application consultation with local communities is to help communities shape proposals, which meet strategic and local needs, flag up issues at an early stage that developers need to address and to increase the predictability of the outcome.

16. We know that the Planning Case Officer has a major role in pointing developers to key contacts who should be involved in the process such as Ward Councillors, Town and Parish Councils and community organisations.

17. We noted that the Council cannot refuse to accept an application if the applicant has not consulted sufficiently or not made reasonable attempts to consult before application submission. Insufficient community involvement, however, is likely to be reported to the Plans Panel who will take this into account in deciding the proposal and can request that further engagement with the local community takes place before a decision is made.

18. Developers are requested to submit a "Statement of Community Consultation" on major applications and sensitive schemes where there is likely to be significant level of public interest. They are asked to provide a statement of what consultations have been carried out and how this has informed the progress of the scheme.

19. We noted the excellent examples of pre-application community involvement including the Kirkstall Forge site, Leeds Arena, Beeston Hill and Holbeck and Little London PFI scheme where there have been public meetings, exhibitions, direct communications with residents, and Ward Member involvement.



# Conclusions and Recommendations

20. These pre application protocols mean that we have a more structured and robust approach to pre-application discussions and which importantly recognises the critical role of engagement with Ward Members and local communities in helping to shape proposals at an early stage.

## Recommendation 1

**That the Chief Planning Officer monitors Core Cities and other West Yorkshire Authorities and the performance of the new arrangements that are changing the Leeds Planning Service from one of development control to development management, in order to identify and adopt best practice.**

21. However, we heard from officers and a number of witnesses that in reality not all developers and their advisors are as effective in community engagement as others and community involvement is not mandatory. Whilst some developers engage with a wide range of people and organisations over the life of an application, for example in the case of Kirkstall Forge, other developers do the minimum. Whilst the responsibility for pre-application engagement lies with the developer, there is still a resource implication for Planning Services in terms of officer time and input. The developers' role in positive engagement is crucial to the success of the pre-application phase, but some need more support and direction than others.

22. We support the Leeds Planning Services aim of redefining the role of Planning Officers to give more help to developers to form their approach to

public engagement and the involvement of Members and local communities.

23. The challenge is to develop an approach, which is proportionate to the scale of the application and getting developers to take ownership of community involvement which is their responsibility.

24. Planners clearly need to encourage developers to engage, communicate and involve effectively and to the highest possible standard. They need to ensure that developers agree a Statement of Community Consultation which sets out the type, scope and breadth of engagement. They also need to ask developers to submit with the planning application a summary of consultation responses and how these have been taken into account in amending the proposal. These all have resource implications for the department.

25. We want to ensure that all ward members receive early alerts of pre-application discussions on schemes within their Ward.

## Recommendation 2

**That Leeds Planning Service redefine the role of its Planning Officers by aligning the geographical areas of work to the area committees so they can act more proactively in fostering liaison with developers, Members and the local community.**

26. We learned that Leeds is fairly unique in having Community Planners who work in two Area Committee areas - North East area Committee and the Inner



# Conclusions and Recommendations

North West Area Committee. These posts are funded by the Area Committees and their roles are to advise the Area Committee, Ward Members, Parish and Town Councils and other groups on the implications of planning proposals, applications and appeals submitted within the area and/or affecting the locality.

27. The Community Planners have a much more proactive and key role working with the local community, acting as the interface between Planning Services and the community.
28. Witness after witness stated how successful this initiative had been and that the two Community Planners are a real strength to the current arrangements.
29. It is clear from what officers and witnesses told us that the weakness is that there are just two Community Planners covering two Area Committee areas.
30. In view of the important role that the Community Planners play in supporting the move from a development control to a development management approach we would like to see Community Planning Officers employed in each of the Area Committee but particularly in disadvantaged areas. We also liked the suggestion of a number of witnesses to at least having nominated officers for specific areas if Community Planners cannot be introduced quickly enough.
31. We recognised that the current economic climate makes this difficult to achieve but necessary in order to ensure consistency of service across the city. We consider this to be paramount and that it should not be dependent

upon Area Committees funding these key posts

## Recommendation 3

**That in order to achieve consistency of service across the city the Chief Planning Officer**

- **seeks funding opportunities to extend the network of Community Planners with priority given to disadvantaged areas and hard to reach groups.**
- **if satisfactory progress is not made by 2012 consideration be given in the budget review to consider how these posts could be funded.**
- **in the interim and as part of the restructure of the area teams consider the appointment of nominated officers to cover specific areas as an option.**

32. We then moved on to consider the methods by which planning applications are publicised. We were advised that the purpose of notifying the public is to provide them with prior notification of development, which may affect them, so that the decision makers can take their views into account.
33. Notification is a statutory requirement as set put in Article 8 of the Town and Country Planning (General Development Procedure) Order 1995 (GDPO). There are different requirements for publicity depending on the type of application.
34. The GDPO states that in cases where the application involves the submission of an environmental statement, is a departure from the Development Plan,



# Conclusions and Recommendations

affects a public right of way or affect the character or appearance of a listed building or Conservation, the applications shall be publicised by site display in at least one place on or near the land to which the application relates for not less than 21 days, and by local advertisement..

35. We understand in the case of a major development, the application is publicised by site display in at least one place on or near the land to which the application relates for not less than 21 days, or by serving the notice on any adjoining owner or occupier, and by local advertisement.
36. Other types of applications, we learned are not covered above, are publicised by site display in at least one place on or near the land to which the application relates for not less than 21 days, or by serving the notice on any adjoining owner or occupier.
37. Exceptionally, for major or very controversial applications, the authority may decide to hold a public meeting exhibition to explain the nature of the proposal and to facilitate public response. On exceptionally large schemes, e.g. Kirkstall Forge, a regular forum (Chaired by a local councillor and involving community groups) may be established for the lifetime of the development.
38. We were advised that Leeds Planning Services often exceeds the legal minimum as site notices and notification letters are both used and often more than one site notice is posted. The aim is to exceed the statutory minimum in an attempt to engage Members and the community. There are three main options for publicity in Leeds:
- ◇ Notifying neighbours by letter

- ◇ Site Notice

- ◇ Newspaper advertisements in five newspapers: Pudsey Times, Morley Advertiser, Leeds Weekly News, Wharfe Valley Times, Wetherby and Boston Spa News.

39. The statutory requirements as described in the GDPO which are applied to Leeds are set out in Appendix 1 of this report:
40. We were advised that the GDPO states that letters notifying owners or the occupier of new developments should be sent to adjoining properties. This definition of where to send letters has not been adopted. Instead, properties that are considered to be directly affected by the proposal are notified and this is determined on a case-by-case basis. We strongly support this approach as indeed did many of the witnesses we heard from.
41. In 2008-09 we learned that 33,040 neighbour notification letters were sent out relating to 5,368 applications. These were mostly household applications but also included some minor applications. This equates to an average of 6 letters per application.
42. Based on 2008-09 figures, the cost of providing this part of the service (postage and staff time) is about £58,600.
43. With regard to site notices the GDPO states that site notices should be placed on or near to the proposed development. Where there are no near neighbours or for large-scale developments a site notice is displayed.
44. In Leeds in 2008-09, 1,673 applications had a site notice posted. The total number of notices was 2,615. We were informed that the number of site notices



# Conclusions and Recommendations

is higher due to some applications having a site notice and letters i.e. statutory notice, Conservation Area, Listed Building, Right of Way etc or in addition to letters a site notice which may also be required.

45. Currently site notices are posted by a full time member of the administrative staff, who posts the notices and delivers the plans to libraries. The post is Scale 1/2 and with mileage expenses and other sundries the cost of providing this element of the service is approximately £20,000.
46. We were reassured that all the witnesses supported a combination of neighbourhood notification by letter and site notices. We consider this to be the right approach but wonder if the number of site notices could be reduced wherever possible to reduce costs.

## Recommendation 4

**That the Chief Planning Officer look for opportunities for cost savings and reviews when site notices are issued whilst maintaining a consistent approach across the city by 31st March 2011.**

47. We thought that the development of a Code of Practice for publicity for officers organising publicity and consultation on planning applications would help to ensure consistency of approach across the city. The placing of these Codes in the public domain would also ensure transparency and reassurance of the process.

## Recommendation 5

**That the Chief Planning Officer introduces by 31st May 2011 a suitable Code of Practice for Publicity to be used across Planning Services to ensure consistency of approach and transparency and reassurance of process.**

48. We were advised that the GDPO states that local planning authorities have to advertise in the press for major applications, but also all applications for listed building consent (except those where alterations are internal only) and all planning applications for development that affects the character or appearance of a conservation area or the setting of a listed building.
49. We learned that Planning Services uses the Leeds Weekly News and other free papers. In Leeds 2008-09 £59,000 was spent on advertising applications. In December 2009, £37,863 has been spent in this financial year, against a budget of £37,000. Approximately one day per week at an average pay scale of Scale 4 is spent organizing the advertisements for the newspapers. Based on the 2008-09 expenditure, it costs a total of approximately £62,400 per year to provide this part of the service.
50. In addition a number of other websites and publications display applications on a voluntary basis such as the Yorkshire Evening Post and the Yorkshire Evening Post's community websites. Leeds Planning Services also employs other tools in order to facilitate community and individual engagement with the planning process. The total cost for providing



# Conclusions and Recommendations

these standard methods of publicity is almost £141,000 a year.

51. Members of the public are also informed about all planning applications by a combination of:

- Weekly lists of applications on the Councils Internet site
- Weekly lists of applications and the actual applications are available in hard copy at 24 local public libraries. Leeds Planning services again exceeds the minimum requirements for publicising applications by providing copies to libraries. The libraries selected are those which are open for a significant number of hours per week. It is not practical to distribute plans to all libraries as many of the smaller libraries have limited opening hours which restricts public access.
- Public Access- database of current and past applications from 1<sup>st</sup> April 1974. Full details of plans, decision notice, officer report etc are available for applications received on or after 2nd January 2009.
- Weekly lists and the actual planning applications available for inspection at the Development Enquiry Centre
- Weekly lists to Ward Members
- Town and Parish Council Charter- Weekly lists to Parish and Town Councils and on major and sensitive proposals at pre-application stage Planning Services will advise developers to consult with the community and will specifically request liaison with the relevant Town or Parish Council. The Town and Parish Council is encouraged to be as

involved as possible at this stage where real influence over the content and layout of a scheme and the bringing forward of possible Section 106 benefits can be achieved.

- Public Exhibitions, meeting and presentations
- Weekly Lists on the Council website

52. We recognised that newspaper advertising costs the authority a great deal with little evidence to suggest its impact or value for money. One authority we noted stated that the percentage of people who made comments on a planning application as a result of it being displayed in a press notice was only 2.1%<sup>6</sup>. Major applications, listed building consent (except those where alterations are internal only) and all planning applications for development that affects the character or appearance of a conservation area or the setting of a listed building need to be advertised in the press.

53. We noted that the Department for Communities and Local Government published their response to the Killian Pretty Review in March 2009 and carried out a consultation in Autumn 2009 on local authority practices in relation to notifying the public about planning applications and the use of local newspapers. We noted that Leeds Planning Services responded to the consultation and supported the move away from newspaper advertising as a statutory requirement. Unfortunately CLG decided not to take forward the amendment, which means the statutory requirement to publish certain applications in newspapers remains.

<sup>6</sup> CLG Publicity for Planning Applications Consultation July 2009



# Conclusions and Recommendations

CLG state that some members of the public and community groups rely on the newspaper advertisements to learn about applications in their area and that the Government was not convinced that good alternative arrangements can be readily rolled out.

54. Other authorities have investigated alternative methods and publications and whilst there is still the statutory need to advertise in the press, there is a need to consider the most cost-effective way of achieving this.
55. We acknowledge that in publicising applications, it is necessary for the Council to strike a balance between consideration of cost, speed of decision making and providing a reasonable opportunity for public comment.

## Recommendation 6

### That the Chief Planning Officer

- **continues to review the most cost effective ways for notifying the public about planning applications including the current neighbourhood notification process, which reduces the overall publicity bill of Leeds Planning Services whilst maintaining more than the minimum statutory requirements.**
- **improves the guidance note and correspondence sent to neighbours affected by planning applications explaining their right of appeal.**

56. We congratulated Leeds Planning Service for developing the Leeds Planning Service Public Access system which one Member described as now being one of the best in the country.

57. The Public Access system has provided details of applications back to 1974 for sometime and more recent applications have plan drawings, officer reports and other information available online.

58. The new service which has recently been introduced provides details of applications in a pre-specified area and is proactively emailed out each week to people who register for the alerting system. The email contains details of applications made that week and by clicking on the application number, the customer will be taken directly into the details of the application and be able to look at online plans, application forms and so on. Members and witnesses who had used the system found it to be straight forward to use and very intuitive.

59. We were delighted to hear that a project is underway to encourage community and interest groups to sign up for the planning alert system so they will get the details of the applications that matter to them in a timely and effortless way. Groups can be more informed than ever before as their list will be more focussed on the things they have said they are interested in.

60. We noted that so far over 80 groups have signed up to this database and are receiving weekly alerts. However this number we were advised masks the true number of people who will be alerted as some groups signed up to the service operate as an umbrella organisation, such as the Houses in Multiple Occupation lobby. The work of contacting groups is on going to try to encourage them to join the service so they can be as informed as possible.

61. We also recognised the importance of this “database” of community, amenity groups and associations as it will also



# Conclusions and Recommendations

be helpful at the pre-application stage, allowing the Case Officer to signpost the developer in the direction of the community groups with whom they can consult. The community groups themselves have indicated their wish to be contacted by developers at the pre-application stage to engage in discussions about proposed developments in their locality, so they have the potential to help shape developments. This will hopefully go some way to avoid over consulting with some groups, or always consulting with the same active individuals and groups. The benefits for developers are numerous, but importantly by engaging with communities there is the potential for positively working through any issues at an early stage, which may have turned into an objection at the application stage.

62. Clearly, ICT is being used in the process of consultation to free up resources and make the whole process more efficient and effective. However, we noted that the use of electronic consultation is not mandatory and there can be costs to consultees for electronic services.
63. We welcomed the fact that citizens without internet access at home are able to go to any of Leeds Public Libraries and go onto Public Access through their computer network. Library staff have received training on Public Access so they will be able to help and support customers who need assistance to find the information they need. We note with concern that 21% of the population has never accessed the Internet and research has shown that the non-users are predominately those who are already socially disadvantaged<sup>2</sup>

## Recommendation 7

**That the Chief Planning Officer undertakes to build in public engagement for future developments of the Public Access System and continue to improve the design and content of the Public Access Service within the resources available.**

## Recommendation 8

**That the Chief Planning Officer continues to resource and develop with our partners, the community, amenity groups and associations database by using the range of communication channels available to the service and that greater emphasis be placed on pre-application engagement with communities to try to involve those who are hardest to reach.**

64. We heard from Town and Parish Councillors and whilst there was general and positive support for the improvements carried out by the Leeds Planning Service there were two specific concerns.
65. The first was the fact that the comments made by a Parish Councils on planning applications hold only the same weight as that of an individual comment. Parish Councillors felt that this was unacceptable as they considered all applications in a professional way and spent a considerable amount of time and energy commenting on the merits or otherwise of each application. They also felt that more could be done to include them in the process and that many Parish Councillors felt undervalued.

<sup>2</sup> CLG Understanding Digital Exclusion Research Report. October 2008



# Conclusions and Recommendations

66. We noted that the Town and Parish Council Charter clearly define the operational links and relationships.

67. We thought that the newly established Community Consultation database would help to address their concerns and improve the level of information provided to them so the Parish Councillors and local people feel much more involved in this regard.

## **Recommendation 9**

**That when the Town and Parish Council Charter is reviewed in mid 2010 the Chief Planning Officer considers whether any further action could be taken to strengthen the process in relation to Town and Parish Councils whilst establishing the take up they have made of the facilities now available on the Public Access System.**

68. The second issue which was also raised by other witnesses was the concern that often amendments are made to a planning application during the course of the planning process and interested parties are often not advised of such changes as they are not considered to be material. This judgment by the Case Officer as to whether a change is material or not causes concern.

## **Recommendation 10**

### **That the Chief Planning Officer**

- **reviews the issue of re-notification of planning applications to ascertain if the judgements being made by case officers as to whether changes are material or not are being applied consistently and fairly across the city.**
- **determines whether a definition of a material change should be included in planning guidance notes.**
- **determines whether re-notification of planning applications could be developed and highlighted in the Public Access System.**

69. It was suggested by a witness that the quality and amount of pre-application procedures varies significantly across authorities. Clients have expressed concern about the status of such consultation and whether it would prejudice their representations to an application. Others have been concerned that they have not been consulted at this stage.

70. Issues were also raised with us about the fact that that some documents and communications continued to contain unclear and complicated language that was difficult to understand.



# Conclusions and Recommendations

## Recommendation 11

### That the Chief Planning Officer

- considers including in the appropriate guidance notes and protocols a standard wording for communicating with third parties in pre application consultations.
- undertakes a review of all methods of communication in Leeds Planning Service which has not already got a crystal charter mark for Plain English and apply plain English unless there is a statutory requirement that prevent this from being applied.

71. We recognise that Leeds Planning Service have already undertaken a significant officer and member development training programme for those involved in the planning process.

72. In view of the importance of the changes being made by Leeds Planning Service we would like some development sessions to be organised for all Ward Members and Town and Parish Councillors with special reference to the importance of the pre application stage and *rules of engagement* at the pre-application stage, the community champion role and the importance of the Community Planner.

## Recommendation 12

**That the Chief Planning Officer introduces by September 2010 a number of development sessions for Ward Members and Parish Councillors on the changes that have been made in the Leeds Planning Service with particular emphasis on the pre application stage, rules of engagement, champion role and the importance of the Community Planner.**

73. A witness suggested that the pre application meetings the department needs to be developing techniques that present a more level playing field between developer, Planning Officers and public that is much less formal with informal round tables, question and answer sessions and feedback. We also advised that this technique needs to be varied according to the potential audience to be addressed.

## Recommendation 13

**That the Chief Planning Officer reviews how it manages the pre application meetings between developers, public and other interested parties to ensure that they are less formal and encourages everyone to participate in the discussion.**



# Evidence

## Monitoring arrangements

Standard arrangements for monitoring the outcome of the Board's recommendations will apply.

The decision-makers to whom the recommendations are addressed will be asked to submit a formal response to the recommendations, including an action plan and timetable, normally within two months.

Following this the Scrutiny Board will determine any further detailed monitoring, over and above the standard quarterly monitoring of all scrutiny recommendations.

## Reports and Publications Submitted

- Reports of the Chief Planning Officer including
  - Leaflet on a protocol for pre application discussions with local communities and ward members
  - Leaflet on planning pre-application advice charter
  - Statutory Instrument 1995 No 419 The Town and Country Planning (General Development Procedure) Order 1995.
- Written evidence from Parish Councillor George Hall.
- Written evidence from Yorkshire Planning Aid.



### **Witnesses Heard**

- Councillor Colin Campbell, Chair of Plans Panel (West)
- Mr Phil Crabtree, Chief Planning Officer, City Development
- Mr Martin Sellens, Head of Planning Services, City Development
- Ms Helen Cerroti, Development Project Manager, City Development
- Mr Keith Collridge, Kirkstall resident and involved with Kirkstall Forge redevelopment
- Councillor George Hall, Barwick-in Elmet and Scholes Parish Councillor
- Ms Freda Matthews, resident and Chair of Little Woodhouse Community Association
- Councillor Janet Thornton, East Keswick Parish Council
- Mr Tony Ray, planning consultant
- Ms Jacqui Baines and Mr Jim Rogers Planning Aid

### **Dates of Scrutiny**

13th October 2009

12th January 2010

9th February 2010

9th March 2010

6th April 2010



# Appendix 1

Nature of development	GDPO Publicity required	Leeds Practice
Development where application: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• is accompanied by an environmental statement</li> <li>• Is a departure from the Development Plan</li> <li>• Affects a public right of way</li> </ul>	Advertisement in newspaper Site notice	Advertisement in newspaper and site notices- maybe more than one, depending on the site
Major development	Advertisement in newspaper and either a site notice or neighbour notification	Advertisement in newspaper and site notices- maybe more than one, depending on the site
Minor development	Site notice or neighbour notification	Site notice <b>and</b> neighbour notification letters
Development affecting the setting of a listed building	Advertisement in newspaper and site notice	Advertisement in newspaper and site notices- maybe more than one, depending on the site notice and newspaper advertisement in the Leeds Weekly news
Development affecting the character or appearance of a conservation area	Advertisement in newspaper and site notice	Advertisement in newspaper and site notices- maybe more than one, depending on the site. Discretion can be used for applications which affect the character of a conservation area and the setting of a listed building
Application for listed building consent and conservation area consent	Advertisement in newspaper and site notice	Advertisement in newspaper for all applications whether internal or external alterations.

**Scrutiny Board (City Development)**  
**Inquiry to Review the Method by which Planning Applications are  
Publicised and Consultation Undertaken**

**Date 7th April 2010**

**Report author: Richard Mills**  
**[www.scrutiny.unit@leeds.gov.uk](mailto:www.scrutiny.unit@leeds.gov.uk)**