

Summary of individual responses from Councillors to Issues Paper

1. Review not necessary
2. Officers can be too persuasive about how members should vote which is undemocratic
3. No need to change the planning agenda – officer's advice has always been based on their knowledge of rules and regulations.
4. Why should agents have a full summary included in the report when objectors only have a summary – not a level playing field.
5. Do not agree with increasing delegation on enforcement matters – not transparent and members should be involved.
6. Time constraints or costs should not be an issue – could harm the decision making process. Officers should not launch into lengthy speeches about why an application should be approved or otherwise to save time. Members do not unnecessarily prolong meetings.
7. Officers should not reduce the time in presenting items. Problems with printing off plans from the website
8. PAS events are excellent – need to be informed of more of these.
9. More liaison between officers and town and parish councils.
10. Extending public speaking from 3 to 5 minutes would benefit the process.
11. Peer Review Councillor spoke of 80% delegation of their applications and getting through their meetings in no time at all. It seemed all too much bother and wasn't impressive. How much is this peer review going to cost and do we really need it?
12. Marked improvement in committee under the present administration – fair hearings are given.
13. If this review is seeking views of many other bodies, why are the public not in the consultation?
14. The Chief Executive should not be conducting the review. His authority should not extend to planning matters in any way whatsoever.
15. Have not sat on the district planning committee due to the time required so can understand the time factor.
16. Fully support the payment to the vice-chair.
17. Application should not be read out by officers as members should do their homework.
18. Concern about small applications not going to committee as residents feel they have been listened to. Government want all planning pushed through but they don't deal with the after effects.
19. Tracy visited Whitnash and implied that we were doing it all wrong and forced electronic plans on them – implementing this after the precepts were set.
20. Is being the top authority good for applicants but poor for residents who have to live with the decisions?
21. Experienced Councillors on committee should be listened to
22. There should be no involvement in neighbourhood or parish plans
23. Planning committee should have more of an involvement in policy making
24. There should be monitoring of performance and a report to committee of its findings.

25. Quality of decision making is not affected if made late at night
26. Having officers with particular areas of expertise when needed would be helpful
27. Officers should be open to local knowledge by Members
28. Concern about who decides which applications will have a real impact on creating good communities for residences and businesses. Applications should be determined on their planning merits and sound planning reasons.
29. Members are trained before they are appointed to planning committee
30. Officers do not understand the real world and members have no trust in them.
31. There are votes in it and therefore sympathise with the objector. It doesn't affect my area!
32. Officers sometimes have differing views on applications
33. No longer have a dedicated appeals officer and less experienced officers are dealing with appeals
34. Too much pressure is put on members over certain major applications