



| | |
|---|--|
| Title | Review of Planning Committee Procedure |
| For further information about this report please contact | Gary Stephens, Development Manager |
| Wards of the District directly affected | All |
| Is the report private and confidential and not for publication by virtue of a paragraph of schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972, following the Local Government (Access to Information) (Variation) Order 2006? | No |
| Date and meeting when issue was last considered and relevant minute number | January 6 th 2010, Planning Committee |
| Background Papers | |

| | |
|--|----|
| Contrary to the policy framework: | No |
| Contrary to the budgetary framework: | No |
| Key Decision? | No |
| Included within the Forward Plan? (If yes include reference number) | No |
| Equality & Sustainability Impact Assessment Undertaken | No |
| | |

| | | |
|--|-------------|--------------|
| Officer/Councillor Approval | | |
| Officer Approval | Date | Name |
| Chief Executive/Deputy Chief Executive | | |
| Head of Service | 07/10/11 | Paul Pinkney |
| CMT | 07/10/11 | |
| Section 151 Officer | | |
| Monitoring Officer | | |
| Finance | | |
| Portfolio Holder(s) | 07/10/11 | John Hammon |
| Consultation & Community Engagement | | |
| Consultation with Chair and Vice Chair of Planning Committee | | |
| | | |
| Final Decision? | Yes | |
| Suggested next steps (if not final decision please set out below) | | |

1. SUMMARY

- 1.1 This report seeks authorisation from Planning Committee to vary its current procedures to allow the Chair of Planning Committee to use their discretion to allow more public speaking at Committee for applications for 'major developments'.

2. RECOMMENDATION

- 2.1 That Planning Committee approve the amendments to the 'Planning Committee – Procedure' as attached at Appendix A.

3. REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDATION

- 3.1. In light of a review of recent public speaking on applications for 'major' developments (defined in Appendix B) and following discussion between the Development Manager and Chair and Vice Chair of Planning Committee, the following amendments have been suggested to the Procedure to address concerns raised by the public that inadequate time is set aside for public speaking:

- The time limit for speakers (excluding Warwick District Councillors) be extended to 5 minutes for applications for 'major development', given they are often more likely to raise a greater number of issues, and more complex issues, than 'minor' developments;
- That discretion be given to the Chair of Planning Committee (or Vice Chair in their absence) in consultation with the Development Manager to allow up to 15 minutes in total for speakers supporting and up to 15 minutes for speakers objecting to an application for 'major development' (excluding Warwick District Councillors, Town/Parish Council representative, CAAF representative); and,
- The same amount of time allocated for public speakers supporting an application for 'major development' will be allocated to those public speakers objecting, and vice versa, irrespective of the number of speakers (NB: the requirement for balance would also remain for all other applications).

- 3.2. An amended procedure is attached at Appendix A for the approval of Planning Committee.

4. POLICY FRAMEWORK

- 4.1 **Policy Framework** – giving more time for public speaking and ensuring both those in support and objection have equal amounts of time is consistent with the Council's core values of being community focused, and fairness and equity.

- 4.2 **Fit for the Future** – not applicable

5. **BUDGETARY FRAMEWORK**

- 5.1 Increasing the number of speakers permitted for 'major' developments is likely to increase the length of time taken to determine those proposals and therefore the cost to the Council of running Planning Committee, however, the number of applications is a relatively small proportion of the total applications that go to Committee and not all will generate sufficient interest to result in more speakers.

6. **ALTERNATIVE OPTION(S) CONSIDERED**

- 6.1 The amendments could not be made to the procedure, however, this would not address the concerns raised by members of the public or officers.